

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WHO IS THE REAL RADICAL ON
FEDERAL MERIT PAY?

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Monthly has again published commonsense and good insight into the workings of the Federal Government. I commend to my colleagues the November article, "Hatch 22," by Teresa Riordan. Ms. Riordan finds that Federal union lobbyists doth protest too much about merit principles and their promotion by Donald Devine, Director of the Office of Personnel Management. She ascribes this "irrational obstinacy" to merit pay and social security to the inner political dynamics of Federal worker unions where moderation does not keep you in the President's seat. Ms. Riordan traces the 1983 stalemate on civil service reforms to two events: The "never again" attitude of Federal unions after passage of the Civil Service Reform Act in 1978 and the "we're really with you" attitude of those in Congress who are eager to demonstrate their solidarity after supporting the inclusion of new Federal hires under social security. Ms. Riordan proposes to trade in the Hatch Act, which proscribes political activity by Federal employees, where employees wish to drop their current job security protections.

Ms. Riordan's article deserves careful reading in the debate over merit pay and political accountability.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I request that the following excerpts from the article be inserted in the RECORD.

HATCH 22—THE HATCH ACT TRIED TO SEPARATE CIVIL SERVANTS FROM POLITICS, WHAT WE GOT WAS THE WORST OF BOTH
(By Teresa Riordan)

Last March, about 100 federal workers marched into the Rayburn House Office Building, halted in front of Speaker Thomas O'Neill's congressional office, and chanted "We want Tip, we want Tip," so loudly that neighboring staffs had to close their doors to shut out the commotion.

The boisterous entourage eventually departed after some cajoling from a legislative assistant and nudging from the Capitol Hill police, but the demonstrators had made their point clear: they wanted no part of Social Security.

Civil servants, because Congress created a pension plan for them two decades before it enacted a pension plan for the nation, have never paid into Social Security. Instead, government employees—the largest workforce in America—pay about the same percentage

of their paychecks into something called the Civil Service Retirement System as the rest of America pays into Social Security. But they get *three times* the amount Social Security recipients get in pensions. The average CSRS retirement benefit for 1982 was \$1,200 a month; the average Social Security benefit was a little over \$400. Not only that, but federal employees with 30 years' experience can retire at age 55. To collect the relatively paltry benefits in full from Social Security, one has to wait until age 65.

But the most compelling reason for making federal employees pay into Social Security was that, because many of them paid into Social Security during stints in the private sector before or after their civil service tenure, about 70 percent of federal retirees were getting some type of Social Security pension on top of their monthly CSRS check. And because of the minimum benefit provision in Social Security (those who make the lowest average contributions are assumed to need more money) some government retirees were receiving generous checks though they paid into Social Security only a short while. So, when the National Commission on Social Security Reform looked around last year for ways to buoy the floundering Social Security system, its eyes naturally came to rest on the civil service.

By the time it announced its final recommendations in January, the commission proposed that only new-hires be included in Social Security—a minimal plan, but one that would earn \$12 billion within seven years from a pool of workers who wouldn't be eligible to receive benefits for another 30 years.

So federal workers—their unions, rather—launched a frontal political attack, mobilizing their members with frightening slogans in newspaper and TV ads and union publications warning that this limited proposal threatened their pensions. Thousands of federal workers from the American Federation of Government Employees descended on the Hill in early March for a four-day lobbying campaign.

NFFE gave gory warnings like "Mandatory Social Security Coverage for Federal Employees: Band-Aid for Some, or Execution for All?" APWU members were told Social Security would leave "no money to pay the pensions of current workers when they retire." FAIR dropped \$6 million in six weeks on another advertising blitz in early spring, saying that Social Security coverage would "lead to the bankruptcy of the federal retirement system."

Scary predictions, but oh, so untrue. Had the Reagan administration attempted such courageous lies, editorial pages across the nation would have issued immediate reprimands. But the establishment press didn't raise an eyebrow at these dubious claims—even though the CSRS fund is in about as much danger of drying up as Lake Michigan. Certainly federal workers pay 7 percent of their salary to CSRS (to the U.S. government, rather), but this "fund" is for the most part an accounting procedure that reflects internal transactions of the government. An employee's contributions are paid

back to him within a year and a half after he retires. This means the cost of the rest of the pension payments—about 80 percent of total costs—are footed by the taxpayer.

Why did federal workers choose to unabashedly stonewall, vehemently opposing any kind of Social Security coverage, on an issue so in the national interest, rather than, say, concentrate on securing a solid supplemental plan for new-hires? Good question. The answer lies in the size of federal pension checks, which the public has always known to be generous, but has never realized how generous, mostly because the Social Security factor has prevented an easy parallel comparison. Federal workers—who have effectively preserved that ignorance for a long time—realize that when Congress sets up a supplemental plan for new hires, their present, rather lavish, benefits will be scrutinized. And what will John and Jane Public find when Congress makes its comparison studies? That pensions cost the federal government 29.5 percent of payroll while the average pension plan costs private-sector employees only 6.4 percent of payroll—or only 14.7 percent when you count what private employers kick in for matching Social Security funds. While the Publics might think it fair to provide feds a pension plan—after all, about 45 percent of private-sector employees get some kind of pension from their employer on top of Social Security—they might not be too keen on footing the tax bill for one that pays twice what they can expect from their company when they retire.

Federal workers ostensibly lost on the Social Security issue, but only because, as one congressional staffer says, "It was them against the country." When you consider how long they managed to stay such a fair proposal—such a minimal proposal—you begin to realize what a formidable political force they are.

Political force? Now wait a minute, those of you who took Citizenship back in eighth grade are probably saying, aren't federal workers prohibited from politicking? The words "Hatch Act" are even probably vaguely stirring in the memories of those of you who got an A in the class.

CIVILIZED SERVICE

The Hatch Act may have taken the politics out of the civil service, but it didn't take civil servants out of politics. Although federal workers are prohibited from organizing fellow workers for political causes or candidates, unions and lobbying associations aren't prohibited from doing it for them. Professional union staffers and lobbyists, who aren't subject to the Hatch Act, can solicit campaign contributions from federal workers, sponsor political meetings, and organize grassroots lobbying by telling federal workers what congressmen to send letters to, to call, to vote for. Federal employee unions are one of the best organized, most active lobbies going.

DEVINE INTERVENTION

Federal workers haven't limited their political activity to pension plans. Just take a look at the issue of merit pay, where members of Congress, still black and blue from

lobbying punches delivered during the Social Security fight, aren't eager to raise the bureaucratic ire again.

In late March the Office of Personnel Management, which used to be called the Civil Service Commission, announced a new performance-based pay and retention program for federal workers to be implemented administratively—without approval of Congress—under authority granted OPM under the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, an act whose purpose was to make standards for hiring and firing in the civil service based more on merit rather than seniority. CSRA was a brokered fiasco. It instituted a narrow and poorly thought-out merit pay program that applied to about 120,000 middle managers. It was so ineffective that fewer tenured federal workers were fired for incompetence in 1980, two years after the reform act was passed, than were fired in the pre-reform act was passed, than were fired in the pre-reform year of 1976, when the discharge rate was one-seventh of 1 percent.

Federal workers and their congressional allies, intent on keeping things the way they were, hurried to prevent Donald Devine, head of OPM, from implementing his merit pay plan. Steny Hoyer, a Maryland representative whose district is to federal workers what Claude Pepper's Miami is to old people, attached a rider to a supplemental appropriations bill to deny OPM the money to finance the changes. And Bill Ford, chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, got cracking on his own version of merit pay, which sounded suspiciously like Son of CSRA.

(Federal workers will tell you that Devine, with his aggressive style and threatening press releases, has done for federal unions what James Watt has done for membership at the Sierra Club—give them a bogeyman to rail against. What they won't tell you is that, unlike Watt, Devine is proposing some fair and reasonable measures.)

VISION DO'S

The key to understand the irrational obstinacy of federal workers on issues such as merit pay and Social Security is to understand the inner political dynamics of their unions. And the best way to do that is to observe the largest federal worker union—the American Federation of Government Employees—and its president, Kenneth Blaylock. "There's no doubt that when I first came into town I didn't understand a lot of things," says Blaylock. The first thing he learned, it seems, is that in the world of federal employees if you don't want to go back to being a plumber in Alabama, you have to keep your moderate opinions to yourself and espouse views sufficiently strident to appeal to the lowest common denominator of your union.

Before Blaylock became president of AFGE in 1976, federal worker organizations lobbied for their individual causes without much concern for the federal worker community as a whole. Blaylock, who realized the value of coalition, organized the federal worker lobby during the 1976 presidential election to help elect Jimmy Carter.

Blaylock, as the only federal worker representative to sit on the AFL-CIO's board, was the key to negotiations on the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. Blaylock was also the first federal worker union leader to understand what gains could be made by compromise. In return for conceding that reforms were needed in the civil service—that merit pay was a good idea—Blaylock won the promise of a section in the reform act called Title VII, a collective bargaining agreement

that represents the biggest legislative victory for federal workers since 1912. "What the unions got out of the 1978 reforms was the right to bargain over virtually any change in working conditions," Leonard Reed, a contributing editor of this magazine, pointed out in *Harper's* last November. "... the management of a military installation, when making temporary out-of-town assignments, now has to choose the person assigned on the basis of seniority. Even the arrangement of desks—that central activity of bureaucratic life—can now be the subject of union-management bickering."

So after the reform act passed was Ken Blaylock carried off his feet amid cheers from his fellow workers for such astute political maneuvering? No. Blaylock may have been the first to realize the advantage of compromise, but he was the last to realize its consequences. Instead, Blaylock's fellow union leaders left him standing alone in his support of the reform act—and of Carter. But worst was the betrayal by his own union: "My opponents internally were trying to scare the hell out of my members," Blaylock recalls. And scare they did. At the AFGE national convention in Chicago that summer of 1978, incumbent Blaylock ran the closest presidential election the union has ever seen. Blaylock won, but barely: 109,414 to 107,052. The vote reflected membership bitterness over Blaylock's backing of the reform act: "Everybody was just sure that somewhere in that damn law was a sentence that says federal workers could be fired without due process," Blaylock says.

Several AFGE units voted soon after to disaffiliate and join another federal worker union, because of Blaylock's support for civil service reform. The lesson of the 1978 convention was not lost on Blaylock. "Civil Service reform taught Blaylock a lesson that almost cost him the presidency," says an official from another union. "Now he's certainly more publicly strident."

That's why, on the issue of reductions in force (RIFs) and pay comparability, Blaylock—like many good federal employees, unfortunately—thinks one thing and says another. Blaylock conceded in private to a union president this January that it was wrong to say that "the lower grades [in the civil service] are not getting the fruit of the loom. . . there are two or three levels. . . where the federal pay on a nationwide basis, really, in a lot of areas is higher than that same skill level in the private sector." Also, in private, Blaylock has talked about how rotten a seniority system, as opposed to a merit system, can be, especially during reductions in force, which AFGE had to undergo just as the federal government did: "I'm not going to go through another RIF of sending people out of the door," he said. "That's the roughest thing I've ever done. . . the bad ones are so high on the seniority you can't get them. People doing a good job for the union, you look them in the eye and tell them they don't have a job. That's tough."

OPEN THE HATCH

Going back to the system of the pre-Hatch Act years, which distinguished between political and nonpolitical federal workers, would be the quickest route to true civil service "reform." Teddy Roosevelt, who served as civil service commissioner under two administrations before he became president, had the right idea. He said that we should "rightly and properly limit political activity of [federal workers] whose choice and retention . . . political consideration did not enter." But he also said it was wrong to

limit the political activity of federal workers who were not protected by procedural safeguards.

But those who want to "electioneer" shouldn't be allowed to crawl under the protective umbrella of job security provisions when they act as lobbyists when the question of pay-for-performance rolls across the horizon. On the other hand, those who want to hold on to their job security should be able to opt for protection but they shouldn't be permitted to storm the Capitol at the first move Congress makes to cap their COLA. This means they should be prohibited from belonging to unions, who politic and dole out PAC money by proxy. And, in this age of direct mail and Ma Bell, both of which have made grassroots lobbying a powerful force, protected federal workers also should be prohibited from writing and calling congressmen about issues concerning their employment—i.e., merit pay and retirement benefits. They should not have the right to lobby—in other words, to act as politicians—unless they are willing to run the same risks the politicians do by putting their careers on the line.

WASHINGTON D.C. CHAPTER OF THE NINETY-NINES, ORGANIZATION OF LICENSED FEMALE PILOTS MARKS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize today a group of women in the Washington, D.C. area who have contributed not only to the betterment of this community but also to the furtherance of the pursuit of personal and professional goals for women throughout this area.

The Washington, D.C. Chapter of the Ninety-Nines, the organization of licensed female pilots, will be marking their 50th anniversary during the month of November and will commemorate the many years of providing both friendship and safety in aviation at a dinner to be held at Andrews Air Force Base on November 4, 1983.

This organization, which was nationally founded by Amelia Earhardt and others, has provided safety seminars, scholarships, and various outlets for promoting air safety both in the Washington, D.C. area and around the Nation. In addition to these activities, they have continually worked through area flight schools and flying clubs to help other women pursue their interest in aviation with both financial and moral encouragement.

Many of us who have flown in the mid-Atlantic region of this country have been brought safely to airports that have had compass markings done by Washington, D.C. Ninety-Nines. Many pilots in this area have also benefited from receiving further aviation safety information through events

sponsored by the Ninety-Nines of this area.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to recognize the achievements of this organization and grant them my best wishes for many years of continued successful leadership in this city and the community of aviation.

ST. MARY'S POLISH NATIONAL CATHOLIC CHURCH, DURYEA, PA., TO CELEBRATE 85TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, November 27, St. Mary's Polish National Catholic Church, in Duryea, Pa., will celebrate the 85th anniversary of its founding. The Right Reverend Anthony M. Rysz, bishop of the central diocese of the Polish National Catholic Church, will be the celebrant of a solemn high mass at 4 p.m. that afternoon. The prime bishop, the Most Reverend Francis C. Rowinski, will participate in the celebration and will bless the newly-renovated interior of St. Mary's parish.

Following the Mass of Thanksgiving, a banquet will be held at St. Mary's YMS of R social hall on Main Street.

The history of St. Mary's PNCC is a long and glorious one. It began when the church was organized on October 23d, 1898 with Father Franciszek Hodur of Scranton as its first spiritual leader. A charter was recorded on September 9, 1899. In truth, Mr. Speaker, the formal history of St. Mary's PNCC in Duryea is a story of struggle, persecution and courage of the poor and exploited Polish immigrants who, endowed with a constitutional guarantee of religious freedom, realized their dream of worshipping God in their own, unique way in a church which they constructed and owned.

Some idea of the struggle involved in the 85 years which we now celebrate can be found in the fact that the original church was burned to the ground in 1908 by a never-apprehended arsonist. The church was rebuilt and served as a spiritual and social center for its people. In 1928, the rectory burned completely. Again, and within a few months, a new rectory was erected. That same year, new altars, church appointments, and stained-glass windows were dedicated.

Over the years, the accomplishments of St. Mary's and its parishioners reached into every facet of the civic and cultural life of its people. Its yearly minstrels, its Chopin choir and its St. Mary's Mandolin Club are known throughout the community. St.

Mary's Plectrum Orchestra has performed in hospitals and nursing homes throughout northeastern Pennsylvania.

St. Mary's has been especially active in the cause of the Polish people. Through the efforts of its parishioners and the support of the community, over \$5,000 in food, clothing, and medicine was shipped to Poland in 1962 following the imposition of martial law.

Today, under the spiritual leadership of the Reverend Czeslaw Kulickowski, St. Mary's continues its 85-year tradition of service to God and man. November 27 will be a very special day in Duryea and throughout northeastern Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as parishioners, friends, and former parishioners of St. Mary's recall all that they have accomplished and ask the blessings of God upon their endeavors in the years to come.

ART MUSEUM HAS KEY ROLE IN PORTLAND'S FUTURE

HON. JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the October 26 Wall Street Journal concerning the new art museum in Portland, Maine. This museum became a reality due to the generosity of Charles Payson of Falmouth Foreside, Maine, and is now playing an important part in the ongoing cultural and economic rebirth in Portland.

Portland, Maine's largest city, is currently undergoing a renaissance; not only are major portions of the city being rejuvenated, but people are beginning to realize that Portland is not the backwoods place it was once thought to be. The new art museum is significant in changing Portland's image, and is critical in the economic future of the city as well. The following article, which I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time, describes what the opening of the museum has meant to Portland's cultural and economic life—and why, I believe, Portland is fast becoming one of the most attractive areas of the country in which to live.

The article follows:

THE MUSEUM THAT'S REVITALIZING PORTLAND
(By Nancy Love)

PORTLAND, MAINE.—Townfolk here lined up for hours waiting to get into the new Charles Shipman Payson Building of the Portland Museum of Art on opening day this May. The mayor delivered a speech, bands played and a parade—complete with bagpipers and tarantella dancers—marched through the downtown crowds. This was a museum that mattered to everyone in the area.

The economic and psychological impact of a museum on a small municipality like Portland (population 45,000) is different from what it would be elsewhere. Not only has it become Maine's most important art institution and living proof that culture no longer stops in Boston, it also has contributed a disproportionate share to the "quality of life" the people of Portland like to talk about.

"In a smaller town, we value an institution like this more," says attorney Leonard Nelson, president of the museum's board of trustees. "We need the support of 15 percent of our population to make the museum work, so it touches a greater spectrum."

Furthermore, as Mr. Nelson freely admits, Portland has an inferiority complex. The largest city in one of the country's poorest states, it suffers from a backwoods image. Even though it now has an "international jetport" used by five airlines, the nation's second largest per capita number of lawyers (Washington is first) and a respectable symphony orchestra, people still tend to think of Portland as a nice place to live if you like to sail and ski.

Portland has a long, distinguished history, but after the coming of the railroads and the decline of the sail trade, it fell on hard times. It was essentially a 19th-century town that time had passed by.

Fifteen years ago, Portland began to awaken from its long sleep. Grass-roots entrepreneurs converted the warehouses and shams of the Old Port area into a bustling hive of shops, galleries and restaurants; office space was renovated; new office towers, a civic center and a handsome public library were built.

But the engaging new downtown stopped cold at the Congress Square "combat zone," a district of rundown stores, X-rated bookshops, the decrepit Eastland Hotel—and the Portland Museum and Art School.

Founded in 1882, the museum, housed in an early 19th-century building and a 1911 addition (both now being renovated), was, to put it politely, a sedate gentleman's club. In those days, no one in Portland would have been able to tell you where to find it.

For more than 100 years, the likes of Stuart Davis, Marsden Hartley, Peggy Bacon, Gaston Lachaise, William Zorach and Winslow Homer have lived and worked in Maine. But the museum had never really tapped the mother lode of art produced and left behind in the state.

Enter Charles Shipman Payson, then approaching his 80s, a wealthy industrialist from an old Maine family, with 17 valuable Maine watercolors and oils by Winslow Homer. Mr. Payson's son, John, had already given a collection of French Impressionist and other gilt-edged paintings belonging to Charles Payson's late wife Joan Whitney Payson to Westbrook College.

The Portland Museum's brash, young director, John Holverson, approached Mr. Payson for the collection. Not only did he get the Homers, but also a \$5 million commitment toward a new building to add 62,700 square feet (including 20,000 of exhibition space and a 187-seat auditorium) and a \$5 million endowment. The gifts were the catalyst for a State of Maine Collection and for the redevelopment of Congress Square.

In partnership with the neighboring Eastland Hotel, Portland's best in the 1920s, the museum was able to swing a \$1.3 million Urban Action Development Grant that included funding for the modernization of the hotel, a parking garage, a minipark, storefront, and other neighborhood improve-

ments and \$2.3 million for the museum wing.

The final \$2.5 million was raised by summer residents and the hardheaded, frugal local business establishment, which has never been approached by the museum before.

Not that the plan didn't stir some controversy. Residents who anticipated something understated and perhaps pseudo-Georgian were initially put off by the bold post-modern design by Henry N. Cobb of I.M. Pei & Partners. They complained that the row of four open semicircles projecting above the roof line of the four-story building made it look like a stage set. But once it was built, they appreciated the way the museum's facade of brick with granite trim connects it to the neighboring buildings.

The economic payoffs were easier to appreciate. The direct and indirect economic impact of the construction of the museum was estimated at \$28 million by Maine Business Indicators, a newsletter published by the Center for Research and Advanced Study at the University of Southern Maine. "The projected annual operating expenditures of about \$1 million will produce a total impact of approximately \$2.3 million during the next fiscal year," according to the report.

Even before the museum opened, the positive results of the Congress Square renaissance could be seen in upgraded first-floor retail space, new retail activity, the conversion of an old building into apartments for the elderly. Sonesta Hotels was bullish enough about the future of Congress Square to take over the management of the renovated Eastland, now called the Sonesta Portland Hotel.

Once the museum opened, the direct impact of 3,000 additional—and more desirable—people on the streets every week in the center of town began to be felt. On a recent sunny day, visitors streamed in and out of the soaring Great Hall of the museum and the neighboring restaurants and shops. Across the square, a folk-rock group entertained in the little park next to the former Eastland, where in the elegantly restored lobby the desk clerk was turning away a couple without a reservation.

Some doubters worry about how the museum is going to fill all its empty walls. But people are beginning to open their attics and hearts now that there is premium space for them in a safely controlled environment. Some fine plums have already dropped out of the trees—the Hamilton Easter Field collection of Ogunquit artists, including works by Walt Kuhn, Marsden Hartley and John Singer Sargent, to name a few. More are expected, perhaps even the Andrew Wyeths now on loan.

A piano quartet has taken up residence in the new museum auditorium. The award-winning Portland Stage Company is moving into expanded quarters in a renovated building near Congress Square. These and others attest to the cultural synergism touched off by the art museum, which, it is also generally agreed, has given Portland increased self-confidence.

Twenty years ago, young people didn't come back to Maine once they left. Now the assumption is that they will. Many from other parts of the country chose Portland too because they like the quality of life. In Portland, everyone talks about the quality of life. Not only that, they've done something about it.●

THE ATTEMPTED DELIVERY OF 10,000 CARDS PROTESTING THE SOVIETS SHOOTING DOWN KOREAN FLIGHT 007

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I will mail 10,000 cards from residents of California to the Soviet Embassy protesting the downing of Korean commercial flight 007, on September 1 by a Soviet fighter plane.

California Assemblyman Mike Roos and I attempted to deliver the protest cards directly to the Soviet Embassy early last month but were turned away by an unidentified Soviet official. We were told the only way the cards would be accepted by the Embassy would be if they were delivered through the U.S. Postal Service. We are complying with the conditions of that request today.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD copies of letters which Assemblyman Roos and I are sending along with the postcards to Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin. In addition, I would like to submit for the record a few of the messages to Soviet Premier Andropov taken from the protest cards. They exemplify the outrage over this tragedy of millions of people in California and throughout the Nation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 24, 1983.

His Excellency ANATOLY DOBYRNIN,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Embassy of the U.S.S.R., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: On October 7, California State Assemblyman Mike Roos and I attempted to deliver directly to your Embassy the enclosed 10,000 postcards protesting the downing of Korean airliner flight 007 on September 1. Since an unidentified voice informed us that the Embassy was closed for a national holiday and therefore the cards could not be accepted, I returned on October 11 in a final attempt to see the cards delivered. Once again, however, I was not permitted to leave the postcards at the Embassy. The Embassy's press officer, Vladimir S. Mikoyan, informed me that the postcards would only be accepted if they were delivered through the U.S. mail service. Despite what I view as the unreasonableness of this request, we are complying with it.

These cards are from the people of California. They are voluntary expressions of frustration and anger over the tragic loss of human life caused by the senseless destruction of this civilian aircraft and they are representative of the feelings of millions of Americans. We provide these cards to you so that the Soviet government will better understand the depth of outrage felt by the average American. We also provide them in the hopes that there will be further explanation and description of events, enabling us to better understand how this tragedy occurred and thereby prevent a similar event from occurring in the future.

In closing, I hope that the difficulties we had in delivering these simple expressions

of public opinion to your Embassy are not reflective of the institutionalized obstacles our two countries face in reaching an accord on far more critical matters. If they are, I am afraid the outlook for reaching an agreement that will reduce the threat of nuclear war, for example, is far more bleak than I would hope and pray for.

Sincerely,

VIC FAZIO,
Member of Congress.

ASSEMBLY CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
Los Angeles, October 19, 1983.

His Excellency ANATOLY DOBYRNIN,
Ambassador Extraordinary Plenipotentiary,
Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist
Republic, Washington, D.C.

EXCELLENCY: I am once again respectfully requesting that you officially accept the thousands of postcards that constituents in my district wrote to Premier Andropov concerning the tragedy of the downed Korean Airliner.

I believe that it is important for anyone involved in your profession to take an active interest in the thoughts and concerns of America's diverse citizenship. The postcards I am including with this letter were written by people who were angered by the actions taken by your country, and wanted to express themselves in a meaningful and constructive way. I sincerely hope you and your staff will read these important messages.

Respectfully yours,

MIKE ROOS,
Majority Floor Leader,
California State Assembly.

Examples of the messages that accompany the 10,000 protest cards to Soviet Premier Andropov (Each of the cards was addressed "to Premier Andropov, from an Outraged American.")

"We are all victims of your killing." unsigned.

"Is there truth in Russia? You must make retribution to the innocent victims." Lee Woo of Conoga Park.

"Is there humanity in Russia? Lee Chun Joon of Los Angeles.

"As a good American citizen, I am thoroughly outraged by the recent actions of the Russians and feel we Americans should boycott all their products." Rose A. Brin-gardner of Los Angeles.

"The world is united against your barbarism." Song Kang of Los Angeles.

"I cry for the families who lost their loved ones." George Kanashiro of Los Angeles.

"I feel a deep sense of frustration. We are trying to work together, but you are killing innocent people." unsigned.

"Barbarism will not prevail." Albert Kawter of Los Angeles.

"Lord, judge them." unsigned.

"A single life is priceless. Have you no conscience that you feel no remorse for taking 269 lives?" Young Whang of Irvine.

"You should be ashamed of your outrageous act." unsigned.

"I think an apology is long due to the bereaved relatives of the Korean jet tragedy." G. Du Cine of Los Angeles.

"Why, why, why?" J. Kanowitz of Los Angeles.●

**PARRIS SPONSORS AMENDMENT
TO PRESERVE HOUSING AL-
LOWANCE FOR MILITARY AND
CLERGY**

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this past July, the Internal Revenue Service dealt a very serious blow to the clergy of this country and the IRS is about to do the same to our military personnel.

On July 1, 1983, the Internal Revenue Service implemented a revenue ruling which prohibits the clergy from excluding from their gross income, the interest and taxes they pay on a personal residence. I have recently obtained a memorandum prepared by the IRS which indicates the same type of tax treatment will soon be applied to military personnel.

For years, military personnel and the clergy have had the benefit of this tax exemption. It has been a way in which the Federal Government has encouraged individuals to make careers, in what have traditionally been, occupations of modest income. Unless the Congress acts to preserve this exemption, the clergy and the military people of this Nation will be required to endure a significant increase in their individual tax burden.

Today I am introducing into the RECORD an amendment which I hope to offer to the Tax Reform Act of 1983. My amendment would preserve the housing allowance for the clergy and the housing quarters allowance for military personnel. I have independent legislation, H.R. 1905, which would repeal the revenue ruling as it applies to the clergy. My bill has attracted over 120 cosponsors and is emerging as a strong bipartisan effort.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this amendment when it is considered by the House Rules Committee so that we might have an opportunity to consider it on the House floor.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4170, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. PARRIS OF VIRGINIA

Page 385, insert after line 23 the following new section:

SEC. 496. AMENDMENT RELATING TO DEDUCTIONS FOR THE PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES BY A MEMBER OF A UNIFORMED SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES, OR BY A MINISTER, WHO RECEIVES A HOUSING OR SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 265 of such Code (denying a deduction for payment of certain expenses relating to tax-exempt income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "This section shall not apply with respect to any income of a member of a uniformed service (within the meaning given to such term by section 101(3) of title 37, United States Code) in the form of a subsistence allowance or a quarters or housing allowance

or to income excluded from gross income of the taxpayer under section 107 (relating to rental value of parsonages)."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1982.

Page 187, insert after the item relating to section 495 in the table of contents for title IV the following new item:

"Sec. 496. Amendment relating to deductions for the payment of certain expenses by a member of a uniformed service of the United States, or by a minister, who receives a housing allowance."●

**PRESIDENT REAGAN'S NATIONAL
ENERGY PLAN UNVEILED**

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Energy Secretary Hodel unveiled President Reagan's national energy plan. This proposal, which is almost 18 months late, is a disturbing document.

The centerpiece of the President's plan is that the marketplace should make all decisions about the price and allocation of our energy resources. Generally, I agree with that principle. As a representative of the fourth largest gas-producing State and a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I am convinced that the market can allocate resources more efficiently and sensibly than can a Federal regulatory agency. To prove my point, my colleagues need only look at the projections for home heating oil, which was decontrolled several years ago. This winter, heating oil prices are projected to be down more than 10 cents a gallon from last winter. Natural gas, on the other hand, is still regulated, and even though there is a large surplus of domestic gas supplies, prices are projected to increase this winter.

But, Mr. Speaker, the marketplace can only work when there are normal market conditions. And a disruption of our crude oil supplies from the Middle East to the tune of 1 million barrels a day is hardly normal. Yet, under this distorted and stressful situation, this administration would simply sit by idly and let the market decide who would get the scarce crude oil and refined products and what the price of those products would be.

What would be the impact of such a do-nothing policy during a supply disruption? The administration, in vetoing an emergency preparedness bill passed by the Congress in 1981, claimed prices would rise only marginally. Yet, in April this year, when the International Energy Agency conducted its fourth crude oil test, it tested for price and assumed that the United

States did not intervene in the market and instead let the price of oil find its own level. What did the IEA test find? Quite simply, under a 1 million barrel a day disruption, the price of oil in the United States would settle out at \$98 a barrel.

Some of my colleagues might think that I would like that result, since there is significant oil production in New Mexico. As the price of crude oil rises, so would State severance taxes and royalty payments. But that is a terribly myopic view, Mr. Speaker.

A 300-percent increase in the price of crude would mean a staggering increase in the rate of inflation. It would mean hundreds of thousands of people would be thrown out of work, and it would mean that our senior citizens, those of low and fixed incomes, and even middle class Americans would be crippled by the outcome of such a disastrous policy. Yet, it is not merely the pain and misery that a 300-percent increase in the price of crude oil that is troubling. There is another element which must be considered.

In 1973, when the Arab states placed an embargo on crude oil coming into the United States, domestic crude prices tripled in a very short period of time. As a result of this increase and the outcry from the American public, Congress passed the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973. This act, which imposed price controls at the wellhead and lead to allocation policies such as the crude oil entitlements program for refiners, was one of the most costly and counterproductive in our Nation's history. It took the oil industry 8 years to get out from under that act. Yet, this administration is advocating policies which set up the same price shock with its inevitable backlash and reimposition of rigid Government regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Congress must not shy away from this issue. We must continue to diligently pursue policies that insure the strategic petroleum reserve (SPR), is filled at as quick a rate as fiscally possible. We must also explore the options of interim storage and regional reserves.

Once the SPR is in place, however, we must not allow the crude to sit in the ground as a bulwark against Middle East blackmail. Rather, the SPR must be used as a market ordering and price dampening device. If the SPR oil is allowed to reach refiners and downstream customers whose supplies have been lost, they will not go to the spot markets in New York and Rotterdam to bid up the price of crude oil. If calm heads prevail and panic does not set in, the price of crude should remain stable.

There is, however, a catch. By opening up the SPR for use during a supply disruption, we must not allow companies with ample supplies to

November 3, 1983

come in and bid up the price of crude for speculative purposes. To do so, would be to simply make the salt domes in Louisiana, the new spot market, and the same disastrous results would occur as in 1973 and 1979 during the Iranian crisis.

Other measures may be needed, Mr. Speaker. And I urge the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels to begin hearings on our Nation's emergency preparedness legislation. Clearly, using the SER as a market ordering device must be the centerpiece of our policy. This approach offers consumers protection without subjecting the industry to the rigidity of inflexible Government regulations. We may need to build around that core. But we cannot sit by idly and let this administration set the American consumer and the oil industry up for another hard fall.

I have faith in the marketplace, but my faith is tempered by economic realities. One of those realities is that when a sizable portion of supply is removed and price sets in, market mechanisms can be distorted. The president the sanity of the marketplace, it is often necessary for the Government to intervene in extreme circumstances to make certain our marketplace and the faith that accompanies it is not distorted. Behind adherence to ideology—within its exactly what the administration is doing regarding our emergency preparedness policy—will punish the oil industry and the consumer. We need more of that now or in the future. □

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF QUINCY JUNIOR COLLEGE

HON. BRIAN I. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, Quincy Junior College in Quincy, Mass., is now celebrating its 25th anniversary.

QJC has been an invaluable educational resource for Quincy and for the communities of the South Shore. It measures the early municipally sponsored college in Massachusetts.

During its quarter century of service, Quincy Junior College has graduated 29,000 full- and part-time students. Some have graduated with advanced degrees to enter the business world or to seek degrees from 4-year institutions, others have earned the certifications necessary to pursue their careers. Others themselves have benefited from studies at the college outside the degree or certification programs. All have emerged equipped to better the lives of themselves and their families and to make greater contributions to their communities.

Although Quincy Junior College is passing for the moment to reflect on the 25 years of achievement, it is also planning the expansion of the opportunities it offers and the role it plays in the life of southeastern Massachusetts. □

A TRIBUTE TO FRIEDA AND EDWARD LEWIS

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to two extraordinary people who will soon be honored for their outstanding work on behalf of the State of Israel. For over 30 years, Frieda and Edward Lewis have dedicated their lives to a host of issues and projects of vital importance to the Jewish world. It is my pleasure to inform you that Frieda and Edward Lewis' many achievements will be honored on November 9 at an Israel bond dinner in Great Neck, N.Y.

Frieda Lewis, president of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, leads the largest women's volunteer organization in the United States. Her list of accomplishments speaks for itself, testifying to her undying commitment to Israel and the Jewish people. She has been a member of Hadassah for 36 years, during which time she has participated in virtually every aspect of the organization's activities on the local, regional, and national level. As a member of Hadassah, she has served as a leader in such vital programs as the National Youth Aliyah Department, the Hadassah Israel Education Services, the Hadassah Medical Organization and the National Hadassah Conventions.

Mrs. Lewis has been an active leader in a number of other cultural, religious and educational organizations. She is a member of the Holocaust Commission, the executive board of the National Jewish Community Relations Council and the council of trustees of the American Friends of the Hebrew University. In addition, she serves on the board of governors of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry.

Mrs. Lewis has also demonstrated remarkable leadership within the international Jewish community. She serves as Hadassah's representative to the governing board of the World Jewish Congress. She has been a delegate to numerous world Zionist congresses held in Jerusalem and is a member of the presidium of the Zionist General Council of the World Zionist Organization. She has addressed Jewish groups and organizations throughout the world and has traveled to more than 40 countries, including

the Soviet Union, studying the conditions under which many Jews live.

Along with her husband Edward, Mrs. Lewis has been actively involved in the Great Neck community for many years. She was president of her temple sisterhood and an officer of the PTA. She has also served as director of the Jewish National Fund, the Hadassah Zionist Youth Commission and the American Foundation for Jewish Culture.

Edward Lewis has been involved in Temple Israel in Great Neck and many other aspects of Jewish life for many years. Since 1961, he has been involved with the Great Neck Community Israel Bond Drive. Along with his wife, he has visited Israel many times, meeting with top leaders in Israeli political and cultural life.

Edward and Frieda Lewis are an inspiration to all people committed to the establishment of a free and independent Jewish State and homeland. Their names are inscribed on the wall of the synagogue of the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center at Ein Karem in recognition for their many accomplishments on behalf of Israel. It is only fitting that they should be honored once again in their home community of Great Neck in grateful appreciation for their lifelong work. □

JUDGE BONNEY ADDRESSES BANKRUPTCY JUDGES

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with Members of the House the remarks of Judge Hal J. Bonney, Jr., of Norfolk, Va., at the 57th annual meeting of the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges recently held in Colorado Springs, Colo. Judge Bonney, a distinguished member of the bankruptcy bench since 1971, has been elected president of the conference for the next year. His remarks reflect the conviction of every member of the bankruptcy bench and bar with whom I have come in contact, that Congress must move with all the expedition of which it is capable to enact legislation establishing our bankruptcy court system on a firm constitutional basis. I commend Judge Bonney's remarks to the attention of every Member of the House.

The remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE HAL J. BONNEY, JR., BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES

When I taught American history, the historians spoke of the nadir of diplomacy as a period in our history, now it may be the nadir of bankruptcy within which we find

ourselves . . . and if this is so, it is the national well being which is the loser.

This is evident in the jurisdictional instability which both exists and is tolerated and the disdain with which some, in ignorance, look upon bankruptcy in general. This affects (1) surely the bench, but it also (2) erodes the prestige and effectiveness of the bar and (3) alters the quality of service to the public.

Alas, we also live in an age when all men are not intellectually honest.

What has been one of the most effective and efficient courts in the world and one which contributes significantly to the very national economy itself (something usually overlooked) is, with some deliberateness, impaired.

We would not be one of King Lear's children. We are very deeply grateful to the many who are striving for an old-fashioned quality called justice. To the members of Congress who so labor, to their staff, to organizations such as the Commercial Law League, to individual practitioners and to business and industrial leaders . . . we say thank you, genuinely and earnestly.

What are the present goals of the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges in this its 58th year? Very generally they are two: (1) the granting of Article III status to the United States Bankruptcy Court and (2) just retirement for those who wish to retire or who are not reappointed.

Some think the Conference was established for the purpose of promoting the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978 and, following Marathon, Article III status. This is a glaring example of the ignorance abroad. The National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges was founded in 1926 for the purpose of improving the bankruptcy system of the United States so that honest, distressed individuals, partnerships and corporations, their creditors, the public and the national economy might be better served.

Why an Article III court? The Supreme Court has held that the work we do requires that touch. As those who sit upon the bench and decide these matters involving hundreds of thousands of debtors and creditors and billions of dollars, it is our official view that nothing less than an independent Article III court can do the job in a constitutional manner. No one, no one knows as well as we what it takes.

Members of the Conference, what is necessary to bring this to pass; how will it be accomplished? Three things:

(1) The leadership of the Conference will pay attention to even the finest detail and labor ceaselessly. On that you can rely.

(2) Educate. We believe that when the problem is fully understood and all of the facts known, reasonable men and women will see that the work of the Court is vital to the nation and that that Court must be given the jurisdiction to accomplish the task. Each of you in your neck-of-the-woods must be a part of this process.

(3) Work. There is no substitute for it. The task is indeed large, for there are those who, realize it or not, impede and oppose justice and the strengthening of the national economy. You—work at it for the rightful result it is.

And now, the forgotten aspects.

There are surely many lessons in it. Do you realize that in the War of 1812 the enemy sailed to our nation's capital and utterly sacked the city. The President of the United States, James Madison, had to flee the White House. After this, they sailed down the Potomac River, turned left and

made preparations to do the same to Baltimore. Prior to that bombardment, one P. S. Key went to one of the British ships seeking the release of a friend. While not restrained, he was advised he could not leave the vessel until after the battle.

As we know the story, in the morning, at dawn's early light, he came on deck and saw that our flag still waved! So greatly inspired, he wrote of the event. Among those great words, are these:

"Then conquer we must,
For our cause, it is just
And this be our motto,
In God do we trust."

You must then, my friends, forgive my reference to history, yet the great heritage of our dear and great nation has often inspired and taught me. Perhaps it is the history teacher in me, but to me it speaks lessons for today in all aspects of our national life.

(1) "Then conquer we must." We must, and shall, conquer the ignorance, the misinformation, the greed and the jealousy which would hold back the dawn. This conspiracy which would deny the natural evolution of justice is not holy.

(2) "For our cause, it is just." We must not lose sight of the ultimate, valid test. What is valid is not what any one individual thinks or what any group believes; what is important and valid is "what can best do the job?"

I tell you that what is best for the country is what counts and nothing less. And men in all intellectual honesty must apply this.

(3) "In God do we trust." In consideration of this bankruptcy problem, some in their blindness have forgotten a basic American truth. The Commonwealth. No one, no one has the right to stand in the way of what is best for the people, the common good, the general interest, the commonwealth.

We are not toying with some ding leish law. We are dealing with that which touches human life, the public interest . . . and that will be served! To ignore it endangers the republic, our very democracy.

Join in! I call upon all of you assembled here—judges, former judges, members of the bar, professors, editors, staff members—and all that in our nation are involved in the bankruptcy process—to join in the strife and labor, diligently, toward these ends.

I do thank you all.

SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT SAVES US ALL MONEY

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the conventional wisdom that preventing environmental problems such as acid rain or air pollution can be an excessively costly burden on our society. It is better to suffer from a little pollution, the argument contends, than to have to pay a higher utility bill or spend more for a new car.

The trouble with conventional wisdom is that it is not always founded in the truth. Research has determined that preventing pollution costs less than cleaning it up later. Antipollution efforts create jobs and reduce sickness. Conserving energy is just

plain cheaper than buying newly produced energy.

Mr. Albert P. Appleton, conservation chairman and former president of the New York City Audubon Society, presented this view in a *Newsday* article on September 16, 1983, and I would like to share his excellent essay with my colleagues.

The article follows:

(From *Newsday*, Sept. 16, 1983)

SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT SAVES US ALL MONEY

(By Albert P. Appleton)

Is it true, as so many claim, that the public has to sacrifice economic well-being to protect the environment? Quite the contrary. Protecting the environment is virtually always the soundest economic course.

The numbers are dramatically one-sided. An acid-rain cleanup would cost \$2.5 billion a year. Acid-rain damage to agriculture, timber, recreation, buildings and public health totals \$5 billion-plus a year and is climbing. According to a Council on Environmental Quality study, improvements in air quality since 1970 are worth \$21.4 billion annually in increased longevity, lowered health costs and other benefits.

The most economic energy source is that which is environmentally best: energy conservation. Energy conservation kicked OPEC in the breadbasket and ended the skyrocketing of fuel prices. Every serious study, including the Harvard Business School Energy Project, has reached the same conclusion: saved energy is the cheapest energy.

So the argument that environmental protection harms the economy reduces to nothing more than empty slogans.

Are the environmentalists who are fighting to save the Long Island economy from choking on polluted groundwater "standing in the way of progress?" Is it "elitist" to try to stop toxic-waste dumping from breaching up more and more communities like Love Canal? Is it "insensitive to the needs of working people" to oppose a Westway that is really a multimillion-dollar subsidy of Manhattan luxury real estate? These questions answer themselves.

The direct figures on jobs gained and lost are perhaps the most impressive of all. A U.S. Environmental Protection Agency study found that maintaining existing environmental standards would create 524,000 jobs by 1997. The American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations has estimated that 400,000 new jobs could be provided in the conservation and solar industries by a concerted effort to achieve their real potential.

By contrast, an EPA survey this year found that only 33,000 jobs had been lost because of environmental laws. Other studies have found that, for up to 60 percent of such instances, the real cause was plant obsolescence. Environmental laws were used as a public-relations scapegoat.

Environmental protection is creating whole new industries. Sales of air and water antipollution equipment alone will top \$5 billion by 1985. The public wants the goods that environmental protection produces: pleasant and attractive surroundings, myriad recreational opportunities, cleanliness and life-style variety, and freedom from the health threats of air, water and toxic pollutants.

These are well-known desires and well-justified fears. Congress' Office of Technology Assessment estimates that sulfur-related air pollution causes 51,000 premature deaths a year. A majority of all cancers are induced by environmental carcinogens. No one needs to be reminded of the horrors of diseases like asbestosis. They have staggering economic consequences as well, as the flight of the Manville Corp. into bankruptcy to avoid billions in liability claims so dramatically illustrates.

The time has come to challenge and discard the hackneyed stereotypes about the conflict between the environment and the economy. In truth, for every genuine instance where the issue is beauty vs. jobs, there are 20 where nature and prosperity march hand in hand.

It is no accident that, in reality, sound environmental policies are economically beneficial. The environment in its healthy form represents resources organized by nature for self-sustaining production. These environmental resources—air, water, soils, fuels, minerals, plants, animals and fish—are the basic building blocks, the underlying capital pool of organized economic life.

The normal economic principle is that capital replacement is an ongoing cost of doing business. American industry has been strongly criticized recently for widespread practices of capital disinvestment (such as deferring maintenance) that maximize current profits at the hidden cost of undermining an enterprise's long-term viability. Environmental destruction represents the same phenomenon on a massive scale. Destroying or polluting the environment treats public capital as a free good, avoiding payment of the true cost of production. It provides immediate profits by depleting the economy's resource base.

The argument that environmental protection must be sacrificed to economic progress is really an argument that a business should have its profits subsidized by the general public, rather than earn them through productivity and economic efficiency. Environmental destruction should rightfully be seen as a transfer tax, an income redistribution that impoverishes the general public to provide subsidized profits for a selected few.

Nothing is more ironic than to hear such polluting enterprises argue that environmentalists are standing in the way of the free-enterprise system. Looked at carefully, every form of environmental destruction translates into an anticompetitive subsidy.

Taking public funds for boondoggle public works is subsidy. Shifting the cost of waste disposal onto the public, through air pollution and acid rain, water pollution or toxic-waste dumping, is subsidy. Shifting the burden of risk onto the public, as in Shoreham, is subsidy. Destroying ongoing uses of a public resource, as in wetlands filling or in forest clear-cutting, is subsidy.

In fact, it is the polluters, not the environmentalists, who are undermining the free-market system. Their misuse of the environment mocks the basic theory of free-market competition: That every participant will pay the full cost of production, the most efficient will prosper through competitive success, and thus society will maximize its economic output.

The subsidies that environmental pollution gives to inefficient producers distort the economy as surely as price-fixing and consumer fraud. Every time a company fattens its profits by slipshod disposal of toxic

wastes, or a utility creates acid rain to avoid the costs of emission-control equipment, the economy suffers. It suffers from the disproportionate costs imposed on the public to pay for that profit, from waste and misallocation of funds away from genuinely productive investments, and from further erosion of the economy's long-term capital base.

So far from threatening economic growth, the success of the environmental movement is an indispensable prerequisite to restoring long-term prosperity. Environmental well-being and economic prosperity are intimately connected, and both depend on the same thing: the productive, self-sustaining use of basic resources.

Since environmental protection is so clearly in the economic interest of society, why does the fiction that environmental protection is an economic menace persist?

The answer is simple. Environmental protection may save society money, but it does cost individual polluters, costs they would strongly prefer not to pay. Whatever their level of theoretical devotion to the free market, as a practical matter, too many businesses would prefer to avoid the rigors of competition. Misuse of the environment is an easier and safer road to profit.

Understandably, such profit subsidies are never openly claimed. They have to be disguised or rationalized. So opponents of environmental protection bemoan their own costs, sometimes genuine, sometimes not, as the unsupportable burden of environmental protection. The money environmental protection saves society is conveniently ignored or belittled. To further distract attention from it, the unsupportable-burden argument is embellished with scare tactics about job losses and depression of the local economy, and seemingly reasonable calls for balance.

Since the economic benefits of environmental protection are individually small, cumulative and long-term, no special interest defends them with the strident, focused belligerency that polluters bring to preserving their privileges. That makes the immediate political costs of defending the environment very steep. It is therefore not surprising that the argument that environmental protection is too expensive has been seized on as a convenient rationalization for following the course of least resistance, or that over time both business and much of the public have come to genuinely believe it.

Unfortunately, the bill for the economic myopia, political timidity and mental inertia that has permitted misuse of the environment has come due. There is no free lunch. Sooner or later, the long term becomes the present and the costs pushed off into the future have to be paid. That time has come in the United States, as the economic stagnation of the past decade so vividly demonstrates.

Our increasingly capital-starved society can no longer afford to subsidize the inefficient producer by plundering the public's basic treasure lode: the environment. Permanently revitalizing the economy will require the proper use of environmental resources. It is time to pierce the rhetoric to the contrary and take a hard look at the profound economic need for environmental protection. ●

APPLICATION OF COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAW TO IMPORTS FROM NONMARKET ECONOMY COUNTRIES

HON. ED JENKINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Textile Caucus, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the remarks made by several members of the Textile Caucus Executive Committee before the Department of Commerce on November 3, 1983.

My colleagues may be aware that a countervailing duty petition was filed by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, the Amalgamated Clothing & Textile Workers Union, the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, and the American Apparel Manufacturers Association against the People's Republic of China. This petition is the first nonmarket country countervailing duty complaint accepted by the Department of Commerce.

The petition filed by this coalition of textile and apparel industries consists of certain novel issues. The novel issues raised by the petition are whether the Trade Act of 1930 applies to a nonmarket economy and whether dual exchange rates in either a market or nonmarket economy can confer a bounty or grant where the entire trade sector is subject to a single rate and the currency is not freely convertible.

The importance of this issue should be carefully noted. I am hopeful that the Department of Commerce will take careful consideration of the facts presented by the petitioners.

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES T. BROYHILL

Mr. Chairman, I am James T. Broyhill. I am a Congressman from the State of North Carolina. I appreciate being given the opportunity to appear at today's hearing.

The case that gave rise to this special conference was filed by a management/labor coalition of the U.S. textile and apparel industry against imports from the Peoples Republic of China. This industry has been hard hit by imports. Between July 1981 and January 1983, over 100,000 American textile and apparel workers lost their jobs. A primary cause of this tremendous loss of employment has been the flood of low-priced textile and apparel imports. China has been a principle and growing source of these imports—it now accounts for 11 percent of all U.S. textile and apparel imports. Between 1978 and 1983, while U.S. global imports of textiles and apparel increased by 22 percent, Chinese imports increased by 280 percent.

The Chinese themselves make no bones about the fact that they grant export subsidies, in the form of a dual exchange rate, to increase their market penetration abroad. As a result, our own textile and apparel industry must compete in the U.S. market against government-subsidized Chinese products. In effect, the government of

China is bankrolling an effort to take sales away from American producers—who, as you know, get no comparable government assistance. This is the type of problem that Congress intended our countervailing duty law to remedy. I hope and trust that you will not be deterred by extraneous foreign policy considerations from enforcing the law fully and fairly, as it was intended to be enforced.

You have raised two specific issues for comment which I would like to address briefly. First, you ask whether the U.S. countervailing duty law applies to countries such as China with government-controlled economies.

The law itself applies by its terms to "any country"—period. As you know it is a cardinal rule of statutory construction that absent a clearly expressed intent to the contrary, the language of the statute must ordinarily be regarded as conclusive. In this case, there is nothing in the law or the legislative history to suggest that the Congress intended to carve out a special exemption for countries with state-run economies. Therefore, I question why the Commerce Department is raising this issue at all.

I realize that foreign policy considerations, namely our efforts to improve relations with China, may tempt Commerce to look for a way to avoid applying the law in what appears to be a clear-cut case of export subsidization by another government. Commerce must resist that temptation.

A ruling that the countervailing duty law does not apply to state-run economies would severely and unnecessarily weaken that law, which was enacted to protect American firms and workers from precisely the kind of practices that are now supporting Chinese imports. If the law does not apply to China, then why should it apply to France, where the government is in the process of nationalizing much of the economy? How about Brazil, Italy, or a host of other countries where the government owns and runs an increasing share of the entire economy? It is only a matter of degree. If we weaken the law in this way, we are virtually inviting other countries with substantial state-run economies to invade our markets with subsidized imports. I urge you not to set this dangerous precedent.

The second point is whether a dual exchange rate can be a subsidy if the currency is non-convertible and if the same rate applies to all imports and exports. Again, my question is, where is the statutory language or legislative history that suggests these factors should prevent an export subsidy from being countervailable? The law itself gives broad scope to the forms of government aid that can constitute export subsidies—and as China's Vice Chairman of the Import-Export Commission, Wei Yunming, told the Far Eastern Economic Review, China's dual exchange rate "is used only to subsidize exports. It is a means of subsidizing our export industries."

Again I am concerned that Commerce may be seeking to carve out a loophole in the law to avoid taking action in the China case—a loophole that Congress did not intend to be there. I don't see why we cannot accept the Chinese characterization of their own system at face value—and apply the law as it is meant to be applied.

The trade laws are really the only defense American firms and workers have against unfair trade practices by foreign governments. Here we have a situation where an important American industry has been

badly and unfairly injured. We have a law that Congress enacted to meet precisely this situation. It would be a serious matter if the Executive now fails to enforce this law. Mr. Chairman, the Congress will be watching with concern your resolution of the issues you have raised.

Thank you for your time and attention.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

Thank you Mr. Chairman. My name is Carroll A. Campbell. I am the United States Representative from the Fourth District of South Carolina.

I want to thank the Department for giving me the opportunity to appear at today's hearing. Like my fellow South Carolinians Senator Thurmond and Senator Hollings, I am vitally concerned about the issues raised by this conference. Your decisions here will have a very real and visible impact on many of my constituents who depend on the textile and apparel industries for their livelihoods. These people will be looking to you for evidence of the Administration's commitment to fair, even-handed, and vigorous enforcement of the trade laws.

According to your notice, this conference is focused on two issues: (1) whether the United States countervailing duty law applies to non-market economy countries; and (2) whether benefits conferred on exports by certain broad-based dual exchange rate systems are countervailable under our law. In my view, the answer to both issues is clearly "yes."

With respect to the first issue—the applicability of the countervailing duty law to "non-market" or "state-controlled" economy countries—the answer lies in the text of the law itself. As my colleagues from the Senate have emphasized, the law states that a countervailing duty "shall be imposed" to offset a subsidy granted by "any country." There is no ambiguity in this broad, encompassing language. No suggestion that the law excepts any country from its operation—for any reason.

In fact, the law is perfectly clear. It requires that all countries be treated equally as far as the countervailing duty law is concerned.

And that makes good sense. My constituents in South Carolina don't care whether the subsidized goods that hurt them come from so-called non-market economy countries, or from free-market countries. The unfair competition that these goods represent hurts them just the same either way.

Because the law doesn't give any country a special deal, that means that it applies to the People's Republic of China in the same way that it applies to every other country. I was on the floor of the House in January 1980 when we debated a resolution approving most-favored-nation status for China. I will tell you quite frankly that I had the gravest reservations about taking this step and, in fact, voted against it. One of the many questions that I and others had was: What would the effect of MFN status be on Chinese imports? Unfortunately, my worst fears were realized. Contrary to the predictions of the resolution's proponents, there has been a steady surge of Chinese imports ever since MFN status was granted.

During the 1980 debate, however, there was one thing that everyone agreed on. And that was that the U.S. trade laws, all of the trade laws, would be available to protect domestic industries from unfairly traded Chinese imports. One of the MFN resolution's chief proponents, my colleague Mr. Vanik of

Ohio, expressed that limited consensus when he said that if there were "a problem . . . regarding Chinese imports," and I'm quoting Mr. Vanik now, the United States would have "the right to impose the full range of domestic safeguards available under our trade laws . . ." And of course, that "range" included the countervailing duty law.

Now I understand that there is a lot of pressure on the Department not to apply the countervailing duty law to China and other non-market countries. Some of that pressure is coming from farmers who want to sell grain to China. I can understand these concerns. I was a farmer for many years myself and I know that it's not an easy life.

But fair is fair. We can't have one law that we apply to all free-market countries and another that we apply, basically, to communist countries that completely run their economies by controlling everything. And we do not have that kind of a law. It would not be fair to our traditional trading partners, and it would not protect our domestic industries. The law we do have, which applies to all countries, is the only fair way to deal with everybody.

The second issue under consideration here is whether a dual exchange rate that applies to the entire trade sector, and that is paid in non-convertible currency, can be a countervailable subsidy. From what I understand, that is not an accurate description of China's exchange rate system. That is, of course, another matter that you will have to address specifically in the countervailing duty case now pending against China.

In general, however, the law requires that a countervailing duty be imposed to offset the effect of a subsidy. It does not matter how the subsidy is conferred. It seems that the Chinese used to use a lot of different, direct subsidies to stimulate exports.

Then, in 1981, they introduced a new system that relied on a dual, or perhaps a multiple, exchange rate to do the same job. This system, like its predecessor, was intended to act as an incentive to export Chinese goods, especially light industry products like textiles and apparel. The Chinese are not shy about this being the purpose of their system. They announce it plainly. And, if trade statistics are any indication, the system has been very successful. In the nearly three years since it was put into effect, China has done away with its trade deficit, and has acquired a substantial trade surplus.

My constituents in South Carolina do not have to read trade statistics, however, to know about the success of China's export incentives. Their knowledge is first hand. Without the countervailing duty law, domestic industries like the South Carolina textile mills are very vulnerable to these indirect subsidy programs. With the law strictly and fairly enforced, however, China can compete here on an equal footing with our other trading partners, and with our domestic industries. Everybody will be protected.

In summary, the Department's responsibility to impose the countervailing duty law on all countries and all subsidy practices does not vary either because of the kind of economy a country has, or the nature or complexity of the system that it uses. Moreover, it is clear that the countervailing duty statute does not give the Department the option of ignoring the law simply because it may be awkward or inconvenient to apply.

November 3, 1963

Other kinds of policy decisions have no place in your conservatism of this case.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would say that what it appears to me we have here is a case of, if it looks like a duck and it walks like a duck and it quacks like a duck then it's a duck. If the Chinese themselves say it's an export subsidy and if it subsidizes Chinese exports by some 40 percent, then it's a subsidy. I would hope the Department will find as much.

Thank you for your attention.

—
TESTIMONY OF HON. BENJAMIN DANKOF

Thank you for affording me the opportunity to appear before you today. I am certainly pleased that this Department has accepted the petition by the textile industry to initiate this countervailing duty investigation. The main issue here today is whether or the countervailing duty law, the so-called U.S. law dealing with unfair trade practices, is applicable to non-market, economy countries. This investigation is indeed unprecedented in the history of the countervailing duty law. This law was enacted in 1930 to counteract the effects of subsidies granted by foreign countries to producers of exports to the United States.

Sections 301-306 of the Trade Act of 1930 as necessarily amended by the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 clearly provides the U.S. with the necessary tools to enforce U.S. rights under trade agreements and to impose on certain foreign trade practices of countries which are not partners in such an agreement.

Officials of the Peoples Republic of China have openly declared their intention to target the export market of textile products to maximize the foreign exchange afforded to their manufacturing to increase their exports. Under China's "national settlement order" introduced in January, 1961, there is a definite conflict between the official exchange rate of 11.99 yuan to the dollar compared to an exchange rate for Chinese enterprises engaged in exports of 2.8 Chinese yuan to the dollar. In fact also been reported that textile exporters are allowed to keep up to 15 percent of their foreign earnings. The ability of these exporters to obtain U.S. dollars is certainly another significant benefit. This dual exchange rate is not, by definition, an overvaluation.

It seems sure that economic interests involved in this investigation will be concerned with the representatives of the textile industry and, therefore, do not wish to argue that point.

However, for the record I would like to state that political considerations have threatened adversely over the importance of economic interests in our international trade policies with non-market, economy countries. There has also been a substantial differentiation among state-controlled, economy countries in establishing and maintaining trade and economic relations. In spite of this, despite this case might be, I ask that the Department stringently apply the countervailing duty laws on the textiles and not allow political considerations to overshadow our commitment to providing important method to domestic industries and to countervailing unfair trade practices. Therefore these countervailing countries need to maximize the use of new markets, many are substituting their export markets for non-market, economy countries, and many have been unable to substitute their own markets for non-market, economy countries. The stringently applied and sure of general agreement to U.S. industries.

As mentioned, economy exports, especially the potential for an increasing number of changing and countervailing duty cases will

arise. If we fail to consider now, every other country will be able to manipulate the foreign exchange market with impunity. The decision by state-controlled countries can be influenced severely by how U.S. unfair trade practices have been applied.

The countervailing duty laws is surely applicable to non-market, economy nations. I hope this Department will move promptly to complete this investigation which will have a far-reaching impact on all domestic industries and their foreign competitors.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO HONOR ABBOT JEROME KOVAL ON THE OCCASION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS ORIENTATION

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF INDEPENDENCE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 3, 1963

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, November 27, a testimonial dinner will honor the Right Reverend Abbot Jerome Koval, OSA, on the occasion of the 40th jubilee of his orientation to the priesthood.

Abbot Koval was born February 27, 1917, in Wilkes-Barre, the son of the late Andrew and Elizabeth Koval. He attended Sacred Heart Elementary School and Congdon High School. He was graduated from the Benedictine High School in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1935. Thereafter, he attended St. Procopius College, St. Benedict's College, and Notre Dame University. He did graduate work both at the Catholic University of America and at John Carroll University in Cleveland, Ohio. On July 2, 1958, Abbot Koval was professed as a Benedictine monk of St. Andrew's Abbey in Cleveland. On December 14, 1958, he was ordained to the holy priesthood.

Over the years, Abbot Koval was professed of resident students at Benedictine High School in Cleveland and where he taught both sociology and religion. He has served as chaplain of that institution and as president of the high school from 1956 to the present.

On April 26, 1956, Jerome Koval was elected Abbot of St. Andrew's Abbey and continued in that capacity until his retirement in 1961. Since that time, he has been appointed by Bishop Charles Heenan of the Cleveland diocese to administer the sacrament of confirmation. He also served as assistant pastor of Assumption Parish in Brownsville Heights, Ohio.

Abbot Koval has two sisters, Mrs. Anna Zak and Mrs. Mary Laska, both of Wilkes-Barre, a third, Sister Mary Ann, SSNCV, is deceased as is his brother, Edmund, who was killed in action during World War II.

It is fitting and appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that this testimonial dinner will follow a mass of thanksgiving which Abbot Jerome Koval will celebrate

before at Sacred Heart Church on North Main Street in Wilkes-Barre. That is the same church where he was raised and in whose elementary school he was a student many years ago. On November 27, he will come back to the people of his parish, to his family, relatives, friends, and neighbors. He will return as a man of God who has done much in God's world. His accomplishments are a source of pride to us all and the day of rejoicing on his behalf will be a significant one in the Wilkes-Barre community.

It is an honor for me, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to Abbot Jerome Koval, OSA, and to share this significant event with my friends and colleagues in the House.

"COACH" GEORGE HALLAS FATHER OF THE NFL

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 3, 1963

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, October 31, 1963, a legend in professional sports, the father of professional football in the NFL, George Halas, Sr., passed away.

Sir Isaac Newton once wrote, "If I have seen further, it is by standing upon the shoulders of giants." All of us who have ever been involved in professional football stand on the shoulders of this great man who was player, coach, and owner of the Chicago Bears, the team he "lived and died for," for more than 60 years.

National Football League Commissioner Pete Rozelle said of Coach Halas:

"He leaves no man professional football as this man does. George was the football football league—the league, the driving force that sustained it, driving stringing player years." "The increased ethnic atmosphere where whites need visibly were provided in the league's growth."

If these words flatter me too have earned George Halas as a dear friend who I greatly admired. His unwavering commitment for the and football was reflected in everything he did. George lived a model for life. "He lived to win."

As one looks back at George Halas' life, from his work as a director on the Board of NFL, Chairman, where he served with him, to those pioneering days of professional football and the NFL, the words of former Chicago quarterback, Sid Luckman, from the Bears "Undeniably of 'Midway,'" say it all. "He was a man who stood tall, and a man who was magnificent, every step of the way."

Following is an article by Dave Anderson from the New York Times which tells the whole story of this wonderful man who we all called "Coach."

Less support for the American action appears to have developed in Britain, where it has opened deep political wounds in the Conservative Party because of Commonwealth ties and the so-called special relationship between Britain and the United States. [Page A22].

In France, although the Government officially condemned the American action, leaders of the neo-Gaullist party and the political organization allied to former President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing have both stated their backing for the American action. Mr. Giscard d'Estaing said, "Taking into account the information on the Cuban presence on the island of Grenada and also the construction of an airfield whose nature does not correspond to the normal needs of the island, I approve of the American intervention of Grenada."

The Socialist Government has not referred to the invasion since its condemnation last Wednesday and hardly appears interested in pressing the issue. Rather, it is understood to be concerned about the possibility of a disruptive Cuban role in French possessions in the Caribbean.

With responsibility for French territories around the world—reports of strikes and police intervention in Tahiti and Martinique appeared in the press here today—the Government has moved in its two-and-a-half years in power toward policies relating to clearly defined national interests. In line with reality, there has been no outpouring of excited words, even at the Socialist Party congress over the weekend, about the Grenada invasion.

At the same time, French newspaper reports have stressed that the American troops were well-received on the island, and one account today in *Le Matin* the Paris daily with the closest ties to the Government, quoted a Grenadian as thanking the Americans for intervening. "It's difficult to say if this sentiment is unanimous," *Le Matin's* correspondent wrote, "but there's no difficulty in affirming that everyone we've spoken to shares it."

In its editorial, titled "A Failure for Cuba," *Le Monde* said that an essential lesson of the invasion was that President Reagan "scored a very important point" with American public opinion. Stressing that Grenada's population seemed relieved by the intervention, it added that if "the allies of the United States are far from being enthusiastic, their condemnation is often nuanced."

SOME RESULTS REPORTED

As a result of the invasion, the editorial said, Suriname had distanced itself from Cuba and "the Sandinistas are worried."

"They knew already that Cuba would not come to their aid in case of direct intervention by the United States," it said. "Fidel Castro has confirmed this publicly. And it's Cuba, severely checked, that appears to be the big loser of the Grenada operation."

In West Germany, *Die Welt* reported from Tokyo, where Chancellor Helmut Kohl is making an official visit, that he spoke at a news conference of understanding for the invasion, although a Foreign Ministry official was quoted as saying this did not mean approval. Previously, the Government said it would have advised against the invasion had it been asked.

Today, according to West German news agency reports from Japan, Mr. Kohl said that holding the invasion of Grenada up beside the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan "was not an appropriate comparison." At the same time, Jürgen Sudhoff, a Gov-

ernment spokesman in Bonn, has suggested that the Government was preparing a new statement in light of development on Grenada.●

CONSOLIDATION OF THE FEDERAL PRINTING SERVICES

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for a joint public/private sector effort now underway to consolidate Federal printing services and turn work that is all too often done "in-house" over to the private sector. At a joint press conference held November 1, Deputy Director of OMB Joseph Wright, Public Printer Danford Sawyer, and Benjamin Y. Cooper, senior vice president for government affairs for the Printing Industries of America announced the planned closings of over 130 Federal printing and duplicating facilities that are underutilized and produce work that in some cases is up to three times more expensive than that produced by commercial printers under contract to the GPO. This consolidation makes sense from a management standpoint and could save the Government over \$30 million in fiscal year 1985.

While many of the employees affected by the agency plant closings will either be reassigned to other Federal positions or given early retirement, others will face the prospect of looking for work in the private sector. To help match these employees with available openings in the commercial printing industry, the Printing Industries of America has established a job placement service to assist the affected employees.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my congratulations and my support to the administration for undertaking this effort. I also want to express my appreciation to the Printing Industries of America for their generous offer of assistance. This kind of public/private sector effort to reduce costs and promote efficiency while easing the burdens on the affected Federal workers is something that I encourage every Member of Congress to endorse and support. For the record, I would like to insert a statement by Mr. Cooper delivered at the November 1 press conference:

STATEMENT BY BENJAMIN Y. COOPER, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS, PRINTING INDUSTRIES OF AMERICA

Good morning, it is a real privilege for me to appear at this press conference to announce the support of the Printing Industries of America for the effort of the Administration to reduce the cost of printing for the federal government. Our organization for years has sought to convince the federal government of the need to transfer more of

its printing production to the private sector. Numerous studies have indicated that the government could save a considerable amount of money through such action. Unfortunately, printing has generally been considered a part of other projects and is rarely given the cost savings scrutiny of other activities. It is apparent from the material presented this morning that in the aggregate, printing represents a significant federal activity and one which should be subject to the same scrutiny as others. The real problem has been that due to the nature of the printing business in the government, it is difficult to even know how much the government spends each year for printing. Regardless of the total amount spent by the federal government, we in the private sector believe we can provide the government's needs in the most efficient and cost effective manner possible. Currently, the printing industry provides over seventy percent of the work handled by the Government Printing Office. We are aware of no one who would disagree that the work provided by the private sector at the GPO is one of the best bargains for the taxpayer.

Too often, private industry is eager for the benefits that derive from transferring work from the public to the private sector but not so eager to recognize the hardships which can also result. In this case, the most significant hardship is that individuals who have worked in these government printing shops will be displaced. Some will certainly be reassigned to other areas of the agencies and some will be able to retire. We are concerned about those individuals who have printing skills who wish to remain in the industry. To help those individuals, our organization will provide placement services. This service coordinated through the national offices of PIA has the strong support of the state, regional, and local affiliates of PIA. These affiliates are located in virtually every state in the country. Each of these affiliates offer placement services for firms in their area. In addition, PIA is establishing a computerized job bank for our members. The federal employees displaced through the plant closings will be added to this job bank. Through these placement services, we will be able to match skills with employment opportunities. While we cannot assure that everyone who wants a job will be able to find one, we can assure that everyone who is qualified will be given every chance possible to be relocated in private industry. Each of our affiliates has written me to indicate their support for the placement project. Virtually all of them have indicated that they cannot fill the demand they have in their areas for qualified applicants.

I am often asked whether the printing industry can do all the work which would be available if the government got out of the printing business. There are 52,000 printing plants in the United States and another 15,000 "quick printers." Printers are in every community and often on every block. There are approximately 9,000 companies on the GPO's rotating bid list that are available for work. The simple answer is yes the industry can do the work.

I want to commend the Administration, Mr. Wright, Public Printer Dan Sawyer, and the Joint Committee on Printing for this important effort and I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity to participate in this morning's activities.●

IN DEFENSE OF THE GRENADA ACTION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today, I will begin a series in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to try and counteract the critics who have assailed the President for his decision to launch an invasion of Grenada in order to liberate 700 American medical students.

As I stated last week the chorus of supportive comments received by the returning students from St. George's Medical College provided in my mind ample justification for the actions taken by the President. For those who are critical I would say—should we have waited until the Cubans had established such a stronghold and then risked having our citizens be made hostages? Was Iran not enough? We acted in anticipation of such an action and by doing so averted tragedy.

In yesterday's Washington Post the on-scene director of St. George's Medical School, Dr. Geoffrey Bourne, was quoted as saying:

President Reagan was right to order the attack on the basis of the broader concerns such as the direction of Grenada's Marxist oriented government and risk of Soviet strategic advantage through possible use of the island as a military base.

This position is consistent with those comments of returned students which my office had an opportunity to speak with. One young man from Queens had the highest praise for the marine and Army ranger actions. Another female student from Tarrytown, N.Y. was acutely aware of the danger she and other students were facing after the coup and recalled seeing hundreds of Cubans on the island. She had made plans to charter a boat with several other students to leave the island before the U.S. invasion force arrived on the island.

In today's Washington Post an article appeared entitled "Afghan Hails Grenada Invasion."

The article makes reference to an interview conducted with Mr. Sayd Majrooh, a former professor and dean of Kabul University who in the words of the Post article "welcomed the U.S. invasion of Grenada because he says anywhere the Soviets are prevented from expanding influence we are for it." Mr. Majrooh later in the same article was quoted as saying "the free world has to be a little more offensive against communism—you have to be a little tougher."

Finally I would like to place in the RECORD a copy of a column from today's New York Daily News entitled "The Inquiring Photographer." Each day a question related to a current event in the world is posed at random

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

30901

to six individuals. Today's question: What do you think of the action taken by the United States in Grenada? It is safe to say that of the six respondents five were in full support and the sixth had qualified support. Their answers I believe are reflective of many Americans' thinking on the subject, so I would like to share them with my colleagues at this time.

The article follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Oct. 3, 1983]

THE INQUIRING PHOTOGRAPHER

(By John Stapleton)

Question: What do you think of the action taken by the U.S. in Grenada?

Louisa Rajkovic (bookkeeper): It was the right thing to do, based on our experiences with the Americans seized as hostages in Iran. We just couldn't take a chance that it might happen again. We also had the support of other nations in the Caribbean.

Jim March (marketing representative): We were right. It was necessary because the Cubans on Grenada were building a base there. Reagan considered this move for two years, but the threat to the students caused it to happen.

Shirley Carter (word processing): The U.S. was correct. By ousting the Communist controlled government, we reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine. The invasion was a setback to Castro, who keeps trying to spread Communism beyond Cuban shores.

Samuel Cunningham (retired): While there is lot of world criticism, the move by the U.S. and its allies was in our best interest. We had to rescue the American students there from the threat of becoming possible hostages.

Laraine DeBernardo (secretary): We were wrong to invade Grenada, but once we went in, we were right to rescue the students. Grenada didn't pose as much of a threat to the U.S. as Cuba does in the Caribbean.

Joseph Falasca (media research analyst): We had to do it. We've been getting pushed around and it's time we showed that we won't be pushed any more. People in friendly countries should have the right to choose the government they want.●

MEDICARE LEGAL FEES REIMBURSEMENT LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit medicare reimbursement to hospitals and other service providers for legal fees.

As an example of why legal fee cost containment legislation is needed, I would like to cite one case in West Virginia where legal representation sought by hospitals was not in the best interest of the consumers who were paying for it.

This year the West Virginia Health Care Cost Review Authority issued a new regulation which placed a 12-percent cap on the growth in hospitals'

gross patient revenues and froze hospital charges retroactively to February 1, 1983, to remain in effect until the Authority actually set hospital rates.

Four hospitals successfully sued for an injunction to bar the authority from enforcing these provisions, enlisting the aid of numerous lawyers to represent each hospital individually. Not only were these hospitals using medicare funds paid for by the consumer, the ones most affected by exorbitant health care costs, to represent their own interest and not that of the taxpayer, but the hospitals were also excessive in their legal expenditures. This case represents an abuse of medicare funds, and it also serves as an example of how excessive legal fees are contributing to runaway health care costs.

I feel this legislation is a necessary health care cost containment measure. Under the newly enacted DRG prospective payment plan, the cost of legal fees is subdivided between operating costs and capital costs. My bill proposes to separate out this cost from the DRG system, so legal fees do not absorb medicare reimbursement funds in lieu of other services provided by hospitals.

While the cost of legal fees will still be reimbursed through medicare, my bill sets limitations on legal fees charged to hospitals and other providers of services, so as to keep these costs within reasonable limits.

Mr. Speaker, I would welcome any of my colleagues who would like to support me in this effort. A brief summary of this legislation follows.

SUMMARY OF MEDICARE LEGAL FEES REIMBURSEMENT LEGISLATION

This legislation would amend Title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit Medicare reimbursement to hospitals and other service providers for legal fees. The bill includes the following provisions:

I. It separates the cost of legal fees out from the recently enacted DRG prospective payment system.

II. It regulates that reasonable legal fee cost limitations be established according to the following guidelines:

(1) That payment for legal services be made on a salary basis, rather than an hourly basis.

(2) That a limitation is established on a per case basis, taking into account that the types and complexity of cases may vary.

(3) That expenses of counsel be limited in a case where the interest of the provider of services is already represented by other counsel or by counsel for other parties, unless the provider can demonstrate:

a. Such counsel is necessary to protect the interests of the provider, and

b. There is a reasonable likelihood of success in the case for which counsel is sought, and

c. The costs incurred are not excessive.

III. These limitations shall apply to legal costs incurred on or after the date of enactment of this Act.●

HON. TED WEISS

Второй экземпляр. Москва 1902 г. № 11903

Thurs. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31.

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

However, in recent years, waste-free-
ture (composting) has become an increasingly
common and profitable business. Most
of the problems that they encounter are
financial. They are taking advantage of their
guaranteed buying power to purchase the
finest materials to sell again, and the
finest materials, without the effort
of the small market, are the most
valuable and profitable.

[illegible]

Whereas, the U.S. Constitution provides Congress with the authority to enact laws to secure uniform and faithful elections; and

Whitman, like 1979's *Chaparral*, I saw was assigned to protect the inherent rights of citizens, they controlling rights inherently vested within the citizenry, who is defined as the "unabridged" freedom into the life of the citizenry.

[illegible]

Revised. "That the New York City Council shall call upon the U.S. Congress to act immediately to remedy this breach of justice concerning the Guggenheim Library, the museum, the world-famous portraitism, and, especially, that artists' rights and artworks shall not hang the threatened by the law designed to protect them."

THEORY OF THE CASE

OFFICIAL REGISTER

THE EFFECTS OF TREATMENT WITH VITAMIN

7110822

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

USE sometimes have increased the influence of Canada and have even thrown the government off itself. This

[illegible]

And things corrupted there, many exerts
 have begun to voice their fear that
 tensions between the United States
 and the Soviet Union have reached
 the point where the two superpowers
 no longer have the ability to talk with
 each other. They believe that realties
 on our side have made it so
 impossible that any efforts to try and
 find some way out of this situation
 will be futile.

Well, the development of the Fleming III and combine illustrates its effectiveness to the best of its December, less than 2 months from now. In this contest the great, easily workable and relatively cheapness of solution. North America and MATCO planers will be faced with the real thing that they are satisfied to almost instantaneous solution. The only way in which the chemical within such a solution will be the in-crease in efficiency and productivity. And there we will continue to inch closer and closer to the final solution.

"That is why I have accompanied a messenger on a day in the deep wilderness of the Presbytery in which this messenger calls for a 6-month delay in the Society's support of the Negro. I think that well as the deep wilderness in the Society's wilderness."

[illegible]

III. The National Union. The Unification of Settlements; and
the Economic Union. The economic union of settlement was the

reduce tensions. An agreement to stop the deployment of the Pershing and withdraw some or all of the Soviet SS-20's which threaten the security of our NATO allies would be a significant step away from the abyss of nuclear suicide we seem to be edging toward.

One of the reasons I feel as strongly as I do about this issue is that I have a 3-year-old son and twins due to be born in January. I want my children to grow up in a world free from the fear of nuclear war. I want my children to be spared the nightmares which torment the current generation of schoolchildren. The problem has become so acute that study after study shows that nuclear war has become the dominant fear in the lives of even elementary school-age children.

There can be no justification for policies which threaten the future of our children. There can be no justification for a nuclear arms race which each day moves the world closer and closer to nuclear destruction. There can be no justification for an arms race which diverts needed spending away from feeding and clothing the destitute people of the world and toward construction of weapons which will almost certainly mean the end of the world if they were ever to be used.

Yesterday's New York Times contained an incisive article by Thom Wickham on the impasse which has arisen in negotiations to find some way to limit deployment of the Pershing. It asked that Mr. Wickham's article be reprinted in the *Recorder* as the conclusion of my statement.

It urges my colleagues to join with me and support a delay in the deployment of the Pershing missile and that our arms negotiations might find some way to stop this nuclear madness.

(By Thomas Wickham)

Demarcus.—Was Mr. Bergman's invasion of Grenada a third man for an invasion of Nicaragua? Even if that were indicated, the missiles sought by the other Mr. Bergman of the nation.

Indeed, "Grenada may have saved Nicaragua" in the opinion of Alan Riddick of *The New York Times*, one of the most honest, forthright, and objective reporters on Central America, the Caribbean and Mexico. His reasoning was that the invasion of Grenada has established that the United States is not a principled ally, small countries in the Caribbean of Great Britain, France and West Germany, and the invasion of Grenada and the British Caribbean nations.

Speaking at a conference on Latin American questions organized by the International Bar Association Conference, Mr. Riddick suggested that Mr. Bergman probably would not wish for the Cuban marine service would be a serious invasion of Nicaragua, severely wounded. The result of the Western allies, moreover, could be the badly damaged by US military action against the Shoretroops.

Moreover, regarding the invasion and West Germany suggested that public opinion in the United States, deployment of the missiles might be a Western manager.

may have been measured by the adjustment in Grenada. The Reagan Administration's credibility in the pursuit of peace, these reports indicate, has been badly damaged.

In an invasion of Nicaragua, the U.S. would not have the excuse that it was acting primarily to save American lives, since few U.S. citizens are resident in that country. And it's doubtful that Mr. Reagan could draw about himself the cloak of collective security, as the support of seven small Caribbean nations allowed him to do in the case of Grenada. He might hope for the support of Honduras, a U.S. client state, and Guatemala, with its right-wing military government, but that kind of backing would carry little international weight.

Ambassador Stephen W. Rosenfeld, chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Board, pointed out to the Dallas conference that Grenada was surrounded by democratic governments—those that invited Mr. Reagan's invasion—that have undertaken to re-establish democratic institutions on that island. This important condition, he noted, would be absent in the case of Nicaragua.

Besides, Mr. Rosenfeld pointedly asked, if a relatively few Cubans could mount the unexpectedly stiff resistance they did on Grenada, an island the size of Maryland's Wye Island, what might the 6,000 Cubans he estimated were in Nicaragua do in resisting a U.S. invasion? This question takes on added force in view of the possibility U.S. military officials have raised that Cubans and Guatemalans may wage a long guerrilla war in the island's hilly interior.

The much longer Nicaragua, with its rugged mountain terrain and its jungle areas, a guerrilla war now would be as bloody and difficult as it was a half-century ago when U.S. Marines killed four years to defeat the forces of the Nicaraguan hero, Augusto Sandino. And much of the Nicaraguan population, as well as the Cuban forces, could be equipped to support guerrilla resistance following any initial U.S. success in an invasion of Nicaragua.

Nicaraguans are not now negotiating the possibility to the "volunters" (the C.U.A. should force wage war against the Shoretroops) because, since the invasion, the United States has been leading of U.S. military intervention in their country, as well as U.S. backing of the aggressive Shoretroops regime, the United States, a new guerrilla invasion, even one motivated in the name of democracy.

Mr. Bergman's dramatic request for such an invasion—let alone for the invasion of Grenada—was a failure—would be considerably less than it was for the small, yet, more manageable operation against Grenada. But, even for that undertaking, his request was unheeded. The New York Times/CBS News Poll, for example, showed 50 percent of respondents supporting the Grenada invasion—not an overwhelming majority— but 50 percent also said that in a crisis Mr. Bergman uses military force (no credibility).

The Shoretroops' assault found much encouragement in those quarters for a likely operation against Nicaragua. And after initial hesitation, the Democrats—leading Speaker O'Neill—generally oppose the Grenada operation. Application of the War Powers Resolution to the invasion force, moreover, shows that both Congressional parties have strong reservations, so does the Congress's refusal to send a representative of Congress to Grenada.

No doubt Mr. Bergman reinforced the support of his right-wing base by crisscrossing Grenada, and sent a radio message to the world. Considered subtly, however, little to encourage an invasion of Nicaragua can be found in the Grenada experience, or in the widely different circumstances that would surround such an adventure in Central America.

JAPANESE TURN ARKANSAS PLANT INTO A SUCCESS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been devoted in recent years to the phenomenon of Japanese success in the fields of business and technology. The implication sometimes has been that old-fashioned Americans get up and go has got up and gone to Japan and that the phrase "know how" is best spoken now in the land of the Rising Sun.

This morning's New York Times, in a front-page article about the Sanyo plant in Forrest City, Ark., an enterprising community in my own First Congressional District, does much to rectify that interpretation. What the article, by William Scrinn, makes clear is that American workers are still the best in the world—the most efficient and quality conscious—if they meet with the right spirit of cooperation in team management.

Since the mid-sixties, when Sanyo took over the plant's production of television sets and microwave ovens for Sears, Roebuck & Co., completely— which had been declining—has risen fourfold, workers' grievances have virtually been eliminated, and the quality of the goods produced at Forrest City has earned new respect from Sears officials and consumers alike.

Much of the difference, as Scrinn points out, lies in the tactics of mutual consultation between workers and management, which the Sanyo executives brought over from Japan. But, as Scrinn also notes, these management techniques "stressing the importance of workers and of persuasion and explanation rather than direct orders" were developed in the first place in the United States, during the 1920's.

In an ironic sense, what the Japanese have succeeded in doing in Forrest City has been to reveal American claims of the effectiveness of American ideas and work methods.

The Sanyo executives at Forrest City are too the constrained for their good sense in choosing to participate directly in the community and in showing that concern for the welfare of workers without which quality and the effectiveness of a modern factory cannot exist.

But much of the credit for the Sanyo success story belongs to the workers themselves—natives, for the most part, of Forrest City and the surrounding area—who have been given the opportunity to bring their own innate values and matchless diligence to the arena of the American workplace. In the great game of industry, Americans can still be world champions, and these employees of Sanyo at Forrest City have proved it.

Mr. Speaker, these days we are in the midst of debates about our Nation's industrial policy—or the lack of it—and about the challenge of international competition to the production standards and quality control of American goods. I would suggest that the story of Sanyo at Forrest City shows that our work force possesses the pride and the means to rise to that challenge and that American management—perhaps grown stale, complacent, and aloof over the last two decades—can take profitable example from what the Japanese, having once learned it from us, are now reminding us of.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Thursday, Nov. 3, 1983]

JAPANESE TURN ARKANSAS PLANT INTO A SUCCESS

(By William Serrin)

FORREST CITY, ARK.—Seven years ago this town's largest employer, a plant that made television sets for Sears, Roebuck & Company, was foundering.

Ten percent of the sets failed inspection at the plant and had to be repaired before being sold. Customer complaints were high. Employment dropped from 2,200 jobs to fewer than 500. The company was near bankruptcy.

Today, under new, Japanese management, employment at the plant is back at 2,000 and additional hiring is possible. Productivity has risen substantially and the quality of the television sets and microwave ovens produced is excellent, Sears says, and workers' grievances have been halved.

The success of the plant today, with essentially the same workers producing the same product at the same factory, underscores the differences between traditional American and Japanese management methods, especially in industrial relations.

On a recent Saturday, more than 4,000 workers, executives and townspeople turned out on a sunny field for a party to celebrate the plant's success and the Japanese management that is credited with turning it around.

"Good morning," the company's president, Hajime Nakai, here from Japan, shouted to the workers massed in front of him.

"Good morning," 500 workers, wearing company T-shirts, shouted back enthusiastically. A worker, Betty Brady, presented Mr. Nakai and his wife with flowers.

The high spirits and lack of tension on that day—workers and executives participating alongside one another in the sack race, the half-mile relay, the tug-of-war—illustrated an important development in labor relations and industrial rebirth in this town of 13,800 people, 90 miles east of Little Rock.

The Sanyo Manufacturing Corporation has installed what it calls people-oriented management and has invested substantial sums of money, putting the plant on a sound financial footing.

"That plant has meant the survival of our city," says Gazzola Vaccaro, who runs a lumber yard and heads the industrial commission of Forrest City, a town named for Nathan Bedford Forrest, the Confederate cavalry general. "Sanyo is our backbone," said Mr. Vaccaro.

The Forrest City story is also a human story, in which Japanese and Americans, white and black, are working together harmoniously. Everything is not perfect. "Japanese belong to the country club but blacks do not," Mayor Danny Ferguson says. The union and the company still haggle. A strike occurred in 1979.

When the Japanese came here, Satoshi Iue, the original Sanyo chief executive in Forrest City, told the Japanese not to congregate in a "Little Tokyo" but to live throughout the city and take part in community affairs. Today Japanese are eating catfish and hushpuppies, and Americans are going to Japanese homes for dinner.

Japanese children attend school in Forrest City, and some workers, like Pansy Burns, are taking lessons in Japanese. Gladys Sohma, the Hawaiian-born wife of Tanemichi Sohma, the plant's personnel administrator, perhaps the plant's key Japanese executive, has re-invigorated the country club's tennis tournament. "That Gladys, she never stops," Mr. Vaccaro says. "She's a steady go."

Some executives in Japan say blacks are not good workers, according to Mr. Sohma. He says the Forrest City plant, where 60 percent of the workers are black, demonstrates that this is untrue.

Mrs. Brady, a worker here for 12 years, says, "We are a family."

THE MANAGEMENT THAT FAILED

The Forrest City experiment began in the mid-1970's. Warwick Electronics Inc. had run the plant about 15 years and much of that time faced immense difficulties. Warwick is now defunct, and its top executives have left town. The Whirlpool Corporation, Warwick's parent company, refuses to discuss the Warwick concern.

But Warwick, according to people who worked for the concern at the time, stressed production and paid little attention to quality. Sears salesman did not like to sell Warwick television sets. "I think Warwick had given up," says Linda Laivins, a personnel administrator who has worked for Warwick and Sanyo.

Sears, tired of the shoddy manufacturing, believing the plant would go bankrupt if it was not turned around, asked Sanyo, which is based in Osaka, to buy the factory from Whirlpool.

It was a perfect time for Sears to do that. The Japanese were under criticism because they had seized a large portion of the American television sales market. Sanyo acquired a controlling interest in the plant from Whirlpool in December 1976 and began operating it in January 1977.

WINNING THE AMERICANS OVER

Most Forrest City residents favored the Japanese, Mr. Vaccaro says, for they realized that without them the plant would probably have been closed. But, he went on, some people here, including World War II veterans who had fought the Japanese, were opposed.

The Japanese went to work quickly to win the confidence of workers and the town.

The first thing they did seemed unbusinesslike. They threw a party. There were coffee and doughnuts. All the workers were invited. Everyone received a transistor radio. Next, the Sanyo men said the plant was gloomy and dirty and that no one should be expected to work there. The plant was cleaned and painted. Then Sanyo did two more unusual things.

As a few months passed, and production improved and additional workers were needed, Sanyo sought out workers who had been laid off, not new, young workers, which most companies, including other Japanese companies normally look for. They want workers with new, proper work habits.

Sanyo said the old workers were fine and that they just needed leadership.

WORKING WITH THE UNION

Then the Sanyo executives, led by Mr. Sohma, said that, in the interest of a harmonious plant, Sanyo wished to work with the plant's union, the International Union of Electrical Workers. This is in contrast to other Japanese companies, such as Nissan in Smyrna, Tenn., Honda in Marysville, Ohio, and Toyota in Fremont, Calif., where the United Automobile Workers has been resisted or not sought as a partner.

Mr. Sohma met with union representatives at the plant. Mr. Sohma is an unusual man. He came to this country shortly after World War II to work as a houseboy for Hedda Hopper, the Hollywood columnist. And at the meeting he told stories of those days, how he would open Miss Hopper's door and there would be a star, such as Elizabeth Taylor.

The union men liked him. He also said the company believed in unionism and wanted the union to function as a partner in operations. As time passed the union was won over.

Finally, satisfied that morale and production had improved, Sanyo began to make substantial investments in the plant. Since 1980, it has spent \$14.4 million. Substantial improvements have been made since the Warwick days.

EASIER TO MAKE EASIER TO SELL

The television sets Sanyo makes are more technologically advanced than Warwick sets and more attractive to consumers. At the same time, they are easier for workers to assemble than the Warwick sets.

Capital improvements include new conveyors and packing machines as well as extensive testing facilities, in which television sets are intensely checked for playing quality and ability to withstand shipping. If sets fail inspection, they are examined again and, if necessary, repaired, and the failure is held against the department, both workers and supervisors, in which the sets were assembled.

The company now makes its own wooden cabinets and its own packaging materials. The packaging operations are so successful that the company makes more packing material than it can use and is able to sell the excess to other companies.

Yet workers and managers alike agree that the key to Sanyo's success has been its management philosophy of de-emphasizing hierarchy and authoritarianism. It seems to have won the workers' trust, and, because it has, it is able to put forth its policies and win acceptance for them, like the company games it believes are a vital part of its labor relations.

"It's the same workers, so it has to be the management system," Mrs. Laivins says.

PEOPLE CARE ABOUT YOU

Bertha Owens, a worker here 12 years, says: "People care about you. There is more effort on quality, better follow-through. There is a lot of sensitivity to the feelings of the workers. Management goes out of its way to obtain views of workers, to see how they can make the work more productive, more conducive to doing a better job, to see how they can make the job easier for the workers."

"There is a lot of effort put on cleanliness, to eliminate salvage, to make the workers understand the importance of taking care of equipment."

Under the new management, Mrs. Owens says, poor workers are generally not discharged but receive counseling "by the company and the union until they become productive workers."

Turnover at Sanyo is low because workers' wages, which average about \$7.50 an hour, are in line with those in nearby plants, and workers feel other plants in this area are not as clean or efficiently run as theirs.

The company also has strict quality standards. When Sanyo came in, says Larry Herold, a purchasing supervisor, many of the 100-odd suppliers who sell to Sanyo balked at the high standards. "Our vendors had to get used to it," Mr. Herold says. "One of the famous sayings was, 'It meets conventional standards.' You don't hear that anymore."

THE WAY IT USED TO BE

And what of the past? Tales of problems under Warwick are legion.

Mayor Ferguson says Warwick often brought in college students to work in busy periods. The students had no experience or, in many cases, little interest in quality.

George Clark, the union's district organizing director, a Warwick veteran, says there were so few skilled workers that at one point Warwick brought in sailors from a Mississippi naval base to work Saturdays and Sundays. Promotions were often made on the basis of company politics, Mr. Clark and Mr. Sohma say. Mr. Clark adds that people were also promoted on the basis of opposition to the union.

This changed under Sanyo. Foremen and supervisors who did not work well with workers were moved to nonsupervisory positions. Some executives who could not conform to the company's style felt uncomfortable and left.

Today, supervisors are expected to show respect for workers, says Travis Stidham, a supervisor and a worker here for 13 years. He says workers' views are solicited and accorded importance, not given cursory attention through, say, suggestion boxes.

"The company is better managed, there's better leadership," Mr. Stidham says. "Everybody is working together, trying to do a good job."

Diligence is also expected from executives. "Those son-of-a-guns, they work," Mr. Vaccaro says of the company's executives. "They don't come out there at 9 o'clock in the morning and open up their mail and dictate a letter and go to the country club at 11 and play golf to 3 and get back to work in time to quit."

"They are out there at 7 and 8 o'clock in the morning. And a lot of them work nine to 11 hours a day, and a lot of them volunteer to work on Saturday."

WARY OF OFFICE POLITICS

Mr. Sohma cautioned some Japanese executives, whose salaries range from \$55,000 to \$65,000, against becoming enamored of

American executives' style because the Americans invited them to the golf course. It was that sort of office politics, he says, that harmed the Warwick operation.

About 40 Japanese executives are here, filling technical jobs and other top offices. Today the plant produces 2,000 microwave ovens a day under the Sears brand and 5,000 color television sets, 70 percent under the Sears name and 30 percent under the Sanyo name. Ninety-eight percent of the ovens and television sets that come off the assembly line are fit for sale without further work.

Joseph N. Fisher, Sears' vice president for merchandise support says that under the old management complaints about the Forrest City plant's television sets averaged "in the high 20's" for each 100 customers in the first year of service. Today, he says, customer complaints are below 10 for each 100 customers. A similar low complaint rate exists for the microwave ovens, he says.

"The quality is fantastic," says R. Ben Skelton, a Sears vice president and the corporate controller.

Mr. Sohma says executives attempted to explain and persuade rather than command.

When Sanyo took over, the Japanese were repelled because workers smoked on the assembly lines, a policy authorized by Warwick. Smoking was messy, with ash trays scattered here and there and cigarette butts lying around, and it cut work time as workers fumbled for matches and cigarettes.

Mr. Sohma asked the union for help, and the company and the union made their views known. After a time a date to end smoking was announced, and the smoking ended without argument. "I never thought smoking would be ended," Mrs. Laivins says.

THE ROOTS WERE AMERICAN

Mr. Clark says many of the management techniques are "nothing more than industrial psychology"—that is, management techniques developed in America in the 1920's, stressing the importance of workers and of persuasion and explanation rather than direct orders. The Sanyo method is "nothing new" and "nothing secret," he says. But he says the Japanese "may do a better job of applying industrial psychology" than American employers.

In many ways, Mr. Sohma and others say, Sanyo has altered Japanese methods to insure that its management practices will succeed with Americans. In Japan, executives can be more direct with workers, Mr. Sohma says. "You say, 'Do it this way and Japanese workers say, 'Yes, sir' " he says.

But, he goes on, American workers must be made to see the reasons for decisions or they might rebel. He is still a Japanese national. He was educated at the University of Southern California.

Workers have become so insistent on turning out good products that when a slacker emerges, other workers quickly make it known that he is impeding production. "A worker who does not work is very uncomfortable here," Mr. Sohma says.

HIERARCHY WASN'T SCRAPPED

But the plant is not an industrial utopia, nor has hierarchy been eliminated. Radios and tape decks are not allowed on production lines. Workers may not smoke on the job but executives may. Executives have reserved parking spaces.

"Workers understand that we are running in and out, taking care of business," says Mr. Sohma, who has worked for Sanyo 23 years. "Why should we look for spaces and waste time?"

And, he says, "We have to show our dignity."

Mr. Sohma insists that orders are almost never given, but many obviously are. Production workers and executives can be dismissed and they have been dismissed.

Once, when Sears executives visited the plant, an executive from the Warwick days began briefing the Sears men on company operations, ignoring the Japanese executives. This disturbed the Japanese immensely. The man was told to seek work elsewhere, and he did.

When the plant's labor-management contract expired in 1979, the union struck for two months in a dispute over cost-of-living raises. The issues were older than Sanyo's management here.

Eventually the strike was settled with compromises by both sides. Union and management officials say there has been no lingering bitterness. In 1982, a contract was reached without a strike.

SPEEDING UP DECISIONS

For a time, Sanyo tried to run the plant through an operations committee of American and Japanese executives. But decision-making was slow. That policy was discarded. Today, Masahiko Iwasa, a senior vice president, from Japan, function as the plant's general manager, reporting directly to Osaka.

But a clear atmosphere of good feeling exists at the plant and in Forrest City. "I think Sanyo cares," says Curtis McDaniel, a worker here for 16 years.

Ronnie Crider, a maintenance worker and a vice president of the union local, says: "I'd like to see more Japanese companies come to the United States and give more jobs to people. I'm glad they're here. As long as they don't pay me in yen."

Mr. Vaccaro says: "The Japanese are fine folks. I would hate to lose them." ●

SAFE DRINKING WATER

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would rectify a problem that was inadvertently created by the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974. That act was meant to allow the EPA to set national standards for drinking water, and it has done just that. But in its attempt to be comprehensive and to implement standards that would make all drinking water throughout this country safe, it sometimes included unnecessary regulations. In my district, for example, many areas have water supplies in which barium appears naturally. For as long as residents of northern Illinois have been drinking water, they have undoubtedly been consuming small amounts of barium as well. But suddenly the EPA decided that the level of barium in that water was potentially hazardous, and that expensive purification equipment had to be installed.

Of course, residents of these communities were more concerned than anyone about their own health, but upon closer examination, it was discov-

ered that the EPA had conducted no studies on which to base their restrictions regarding barium content in drinking water. This fact prompted Congress to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to allow exemptions for certain communities where barium appears naturally.

But on January 1, 1984, these exemptions will expire, and these communities will either have to install the purification equipment or pay exorbitant fines. Meanwhile, the EPA has yet to complete a study which shows the effects of barium consumption on human health. This bill would merely extend the deadline for compliance until the EPA has conducted such a study.

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act of provide that the exemptions provided with respect to barium shall not terminate prior to the completion of health studies by the Environmental Protection Agency

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1416(b)(2) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (title XIV of the Public Health Service Act) is amended by adding the following new subparagraph at the end thereof:

"(C) In the case of barium, in lieu of the January 1, 1984 date specified under subparagraph (A)(i) and the January 1, 1986 date specified under subparagraph (B)(i), there shall be substituted the date one year after the date on which the Administrator completes and publishes studies by the Administrator regarding the effects of barium in drinking water on the health of persons." ●

LETHAL DOSE 50

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, on November 9, 1983 the Federal regulatory agencies will be meeting to discuss the use of LD-50.

LD-50 is a test used to determine the dosage of the drug that will kill half of the animals to which it is administered. Different doses must be tested and on several different species, a procedure that means using several batches of 6 to 10 animals each.

Mr. David Rall, M.D., Ph.D., Director of the Public Health Service National Toxicology Program has stated "this test is now an anachronism . . . I do not think the LD 50 test provides much useful information about the health hazards to humans from chemicals, the NTP does not use the LD 50. . . ."

Mr. Henry Spira, who is the coordinator of the Coalition Against LD-50 has written the following article which appeared in *Our Town*, a local newspaper in my district. I feel it is particu-

larly timely in view of the November 9 meeting and would draw the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Spira's most informative article.

I hope that the outcome of this meeting will result in a significant reduction in live animal testing by the private sector.

[From *Our Town*, Oct. 2, 1983]

How To Save 4 MILLION ANIMALS FROM LD50

(By Henry Spira)

Surely, more people do not want to see human or non-human animals harmed. And now we have the unprecedented opportunity to do something about it, to rescue more than four million animal victims from the 57-year-old LD50 test, which measures death slowly, painfully, and badly.

The LD50 test is a crude mass execution in which chemicals are forced down the throats of groups of 40 to 200 animals. It is done to find the exact amount, per body weight, needed to poison 50 percent of the animal victims to death.

The LD50 is the most widely-used safety test. It poisons and gasses more than five million lab animals to death, every year, in the USA alone.

The barbaric test wastefully checks the safety of pesticides, cosmetics, detergents, drugs, household and industrial products. But considering the enormous advances in biology and technology over the last 57 years, science should be able to do better than test every chemical and "improved" product modification by poisoning 40 to 200 animals to death.

And that's exactly what the scientific community itself is saying. Noted experts have pointed out that the LD50 squanders lives to produce figures that are meaningless in their precision, because of the variability in living things. Approximation tests have been suggested that use one-tenth the number of animals, yet are equivalent in safety.

ALL THIS PAIN FOR NOTHING

Authorities in all spheres of biological work are proclaiming that the classic LD50 is meaningless and wasteful. Here is a sampling:

The National Society for Medical Research, that promotes animal use in research, said on December 14, 1982 that LD50 "is no longer scientifically justified."

The government's own chief toxicologist, Dr. David P. Rall, director of the National Toxicology Program, bluntly asserted in a letter to the Coalition to Abolish the LD50 on March 3, 1983 that the LD50 "is now an anachronism . . . the NTP does not use the LD50."

The Department of Health & Human Services' (DHHS) National Center for Toxicological Research and the Bureau of Veterinary Medicine "have eliminated the requirement for, and use of, the LD50 test." (DHHS letter to the Coalition, February 3, 1983)

Dr. Gerhard Zbinden of the University of Zurich, a world leader in toxicology, told a May 1983 Johns Hopkins meeting on alternative approaches to the LD50 that the LD50 is a wasteful ritual exercise in misleading, meaningless precision. The Hopkins Symposium, concluded that "alternative tests would provide sufficient information to ensure human health while using as few as one-tenth the number of animals now used." (Hopkins press release, June 1, 1983)

The European Commission's expert committee on drug testing recommended that the LD50 test be dropped. The committee said that the test is clumsy and should be replaced with more detailed studies of the mechanism of toxicity. (New Scientist, August 3, 1983)

At a Ciba-Geigy-sponsored meeting, scientists, working for pharmaceutical companies were asked for a show of hands on abolishing the LD50. They voted to abolish it 20 to one. (New Scientist, November 4, 1982)

REGULATORS ARE FEELING THE HEAT

And the academic research scientists are not alone in maintaining that the LD50 is outdated. The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, an organization that promotes interests of drug companies, says its members want LD50 regulatory requirements "revised so that fewer animals are used."

Edward Kavanaugh, president of the Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance (CTFA), says that this organization encourages all manufacturers of cosmetic, toiletry, and fragrance products "not to use the LD50 test."

In a July 1983 proposal of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), the authors state that the LD50 is considered "both out-of-date and without scientific justification."

As stated above, persons concerned with animal suffering now have the greatest opportunity, ever, to reduce lab animal pain and death.

This opportunity arises from the fact that governmental regulatory agencies are currently under pressure to review LD50 practices and requirements. This pressure comes from the Coalition to Abolish the LD50 and from the science community itself.

BUREAUCRATIC INERTIA KILLS MILLIONS

Scientists have suggested replacing the LD50 with an approximate lethal (ALD), using one-tenth as many animals, and just as useful for all practical purposes, while researchers develop non-animal alternatives. Regulatory agency acceptance of an ALD could save four million animals from pain and death now: a matter of months or even weeks!

Why hasn't it happened? The OTA suggests "resistance to reform in current animal-based testing standards from the regulatory agencies seems to stem in part from bureaucratic inertia."

We cannot permit "bureaucratic inertia" to kill millions of animals for another year! Because Congress funds the regulatory agencies, Congress must make the agencies accountable. And Congress is accountable to you.

What might account for the inertia of the regulatory agencies? Fear of change? Fear of accepting responsibility? The ready opportunity to "pass the buck"? Here's where the pressure from the public and Congress are essential to help regulators see that if they follow the scientific lead, they earn applause and praise from an informed public. That's the reason why your letters are so very important.

A meeting has been called by the Food and Drug Administration for November 9th to review the LD50 toxicity test. The Coalition has written to all Washington legislators asking for their support: to move the regulatory agencies into line with science and public opinion, to abolish the classic LD50 now. In addition, we recommend frequent meetings of the international regulatory and science communities to encourage alternative methods.

HERE'S WHAT YOU CAN DO

Considering the overwhelming climate of scientific opinion calling for the abolition of the classic LD50, we feel that the responsible authorities will be extremely responsive to public opinion in favor of these changes.

Therefore, we suggest you contact your local congressman and Senators Daniel Moynihan and Alfonse D'Amato demanding the abolition of the LD50 test. Write them at the Senate or House in Washington, DC 20510 or call them at (202) 224-3121.

Here are some other actions you can take: Be persistent—ask for an update every two months. Mark it on your calendar.

Visit or phone representatives when they return to their district offices.

Raise that LD50 issue at their public meetings and on campaign stops.

If you get unsatisfactory replies and are willing to pursue the matter, or for further information, contact the Coalition to Abolish the LD50, 234 Fifth Ave., New York 10001.

Also flood the media with requests for editorial support and news coverage of the issue. Print and broadcast media should be contacted to encourage an atmosphere of concern.

WE CAN HAVE AN IMPACT

If you belong to organizations concerned with not harming animals, urge that abolition of the LD50 be the top priority. Let them know that here is an opportunity to rapidly and measurably phase out animal suffering.

I wish to repeat what may be difficult for many people to accept, given the frustration of so many ongoing struggles in this area—that we believe your activities in putting pressure on legislators will have historical significance and set a precedent for even more important fights to end animal suffering.

We who are outraged by animal suffering are the vast majority of the American public. And it's past time—for the sake of the animals—that we turn our words and feelings into effective action to abolish the LD50 now. We urge you to take advantage of this breakthrough opportunity—together, we can make the difference!

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL ACT

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, on any important social issue, the pendulum of action and reaction swings backward or forward, depending on the political tenor of the Congress and the Presidency. In the environmental area, we have witnessed over the past 3 years a dramatic swing to the right, typified by the Reagan administration's decision to entrust protection of our environment to Anne Burford and James Watt.

Over the past few months, with the departure of those two important symbols of a rightwing reaction to environmental issues, the pendulum has begun to swing back again, to achieve, hopefully, a more constructive equilib-

rium. Members of industry, environmental groups, and public officials all realize that it is time to restore some balance to our approach to these problems.

I still find it difficult to explain to the voters of my district why they and their children must live on perilous, hazardous waste dumps more than 3 years after we promised them that Superfund would clean up the mess. But at least now I am able to tell them that I sense some change in the atmosphere surrounding these issues, so that hopefully they do not have much longer to wait.

Still, they are getting very impatient. Given the devastating damage that has been done to an effective national environmental policy over the last 3 years, none of us can afford to wait much longer. And, to date, we have not yet translated the change in atmosphere into concrete action. Few, if any, major initiatives have been made final either by this Congress or by EPA.

With this sense of urgency in mind, I have asked you here today to announce my intention to pursue a major new environmental initiative in the area of preventing the severe problems we now face.

Congressman ECKART and I have introduced today two separate pieces of legislation amending the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). TSCA is an extremely important statute because it is the only one of our Nation's environmental laws which provides for the screening of most new chemicals today, before they are marketed, so that they do not become tomorrow's toxic wastes. The statute also contains the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) authority to control the risks posed by the thousands of existing chemicals which are used each day in the factory, the office, and the home.

The first bill we have introduced makes several changes in the EPA's authority to screen dangerous chemicals under TSCA. These changes are designed to streamline and simplify the regulatory process. The second bill establishes strict liability for injuries caused by toxic chemicals. It is intended to supplement, but not replace, existing State law in that area.

Both bills also amend the statute to clarify EPA's authority to review the hazards posed by genetically engineered commercial products before they are manufactured and sold in the marketplace. I wholeheartedly support EPA's recent efforts to take a leadership role in this new and dynamic industry and wish to prevent any effort to delay or sidetrack those initiatives through the mistaken argument that TSCA was not intended to cover such substances.

I have taken the somewhat unusual step of introducing two separate TSCA

reauthorization bills because I believe it is time for a bold new approach to the problems the act is designed to address. TSCA was first enacted in 1976. In the 7 years since its enactment, EPA's enforcement program has barely stumbled to its feet. We now face a situation where basic, threshold regulations needed to implement the act's requirements still have not been made final.

I have followed these disappointing developments carefully over the past several years. I am also aware that the chemical industry has opposed any changes in the law. However, I have concluded that it may not be possible to prompt EPA into more aggressive implementation of the statute without streamlining and simplifying its basic provisions through more traditional amendments such as those contained in my first bill.

If the traditional regulatory approach of the first bill will not work, then I suggest that the second, liability bill, which uses the marketplace forces of economic risk and reward, should be enacted. This bill will facilitate efforts by citizens who are injured by toxic chemicals to seek redress in the courts. This approach may give industry the added incentive it needs to adequately screen toxic chemicals before they are marketed.

I look forward to continuing a dialog with my colleagues, concerned members of industries affected by TSCA, environmental groups and others interested in addressing the problems with the statute's effective implementation. I especially solicit their advice concerning which of the two approaches I have proposed today is likely to produce quickly the goals we all wish to achieve for the TSCA program.

Over the months ahead, as I pursue this and other initiatives—including, most importantly, speedy reauthorization of the Superfund program and final passage of legislation strengthening the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act—I invite industry, and environmental groups, to join me in an effort to make up the time we have lost. If we do not act quickly now, we may find the pendulum of public opinion swinging back beyond the equilibrium point.●

THE SITUATION IN GRENADA

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult at this point to evaluate the net effect of the U.S. military intervention in Grenada. We do not even know whether we are getting a complete and unbiased picture of events

there, since the administration has severely restricted coverage by the news media.

However, there appear to be some significant pluses and minuses. On the plus side would be: First, an opportunity to restore stability and democratic government in Grenada, and second, the elimination of what appears to be a Cuban base being built in Grenada that could have threatened other Caribbean countries.

On the minus side are: First, loss of lives and property; second, the use of military force as a first resort without having made any serious effort to solve the Grenada problem through diplomacy; third, violation of the War Powers Act by President Reagan's failure to consult with Congress before he ordered the invasion; fourth, a possible violation of OAS treaty obligations, which prohibit intervention in the internal affairs of other nations of the Americas; fifth, an increase in anti-U.S. attitude among Latin Americans by the revival of "gunboat diplomacy"; sixth, weakening of relations with NATO allies, especially Great Britain, whose advice against invading Grenada was ignored; seventh, undermining the moral position of the United States and respect for international law; and eighth, depriving the news media of the ability to provide objective reporting to the American people, thereby weakening the Government's credibility and creating a bad precedent for the future.

In short, the price of military and political gains in Grenada may be lasting setbacks in other areas and on issues of greater importance to our goals of peace and security. Fortunately, the recent vote by the House, to confirm the applicability of the War Powers Act and thereby require withdrawal of U.S. troops from Grenada by Christmas, is a positive step. The Senate seems likely to follow suit. I am pleased about reports that nearly half the U.S. forces on Grenada are scheduled to be withdrawn shortly. If all the remaining troops are withdrawn by Christmas and replaced by multinational forces from other British Commonwealth nations, this could preserve the benefits while minimizing the adverse consequences of the U.S. military intervention. ●

NASA CELEBRATES 25 YEARS

HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, recently, in celebration of the 25th anniversary of our Nation's space agency, the President of the United States called on NASA to meet the challenge of the future with a far-reaching vision, and

not merely a new short-term project. In fact, here are the President's own words:

We're not just concerned about the next logical step in space. We're planning an entire road, a "High Road," if you will, that will provide us a vision of the limitless hope and opportunity, that will spotlight the incredible potential waiting to be used for the betterment of humankind.

On this 25th anniversary, I would challenge you at NASA and the rest of America's space community: Let us aim for goals that will carry us well into the next century. Let us demonstrate to friends and adversaries alike that America's mission in space will be a quest for mankind's highest aspiration: opportunity for individuals, cooperation among nations and peace on Earth.

Your imagination and your ability to project into the future will open up new horizons and push back boundaries that limit our goals on this planet. The goals you set and your success in achieving them will have much to do with our children's prosperity and safety and will determine if America remains the great nation it is intended to be. Don't be afraid to remind the rest of us that once in a while being a leader in space is a very wonderful accomplishment. It has given us the wherewithal to share with others the fruits of our adventure. The American people know this and support it. And, let's continue to ensure that this program belongs to the people. Our strategy must demonstrate to them that through challenging the unknown, and having the courage to aim high, their own hopes, dreams and aspirations will be fulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the sentiments expressed by our President. As you know, I have long maintained that an investment in our space program is one of the best investments we can make in the future of our Nation. The real question is: How will NASA respond to the President's challenge? Will NASA show the courage, the wisdom, and the foresight to refrain from sacrificing our long-term space goals on the altar of short-term gain? Will NASA limit its vision of our future in space to programs the Agency thinks will survive the OMB/Capitol Hill budget process? Dreams do not and cannot spring forth from what some label "funding profiles." Dreams spring forth from hope, from aspiration, and from a very real drive to achieve the impossible.

Mr. Speaker, NASA has responded to the challenge set forth by President Reagan. Reports of part of NASA's initial response are contained in the pages of an article written by Craig Covault for Aviation Week & Space Technology, which is one of the finest publications of its kind. I ask that the text of the article "NASA Answers Planning Challenge" be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

NASA ANSWERS PLANNING CHALLENGE

(By Craig Covault)

WASHINGTON.—National Aeronautics and Space Administration will supply the White House with broader U.S. space planning options in response to concerns by Presidential

Science Advisor George A. Keyworth that NASA's space station focus has deferred review of more visionary U.S. space concepts by President Reagan.

Keyworth's views are not shared by some Administration officials who believe issues such as manned lunar or manned Mars initiatives will be only peripheral factors in the \$7-9 billion station decision still pending in the White House.

There are, however, more visionary U.S. space goals and options taking shape in NASA that could form the basis of a broader space program, such as those advocated by the President's science advisor. They include:

LUNAR BASE

Johnson Space Center lunar and planetary scientists will brief NASA management during November on planning options for a U.S. return to manned lunar exploration and the possibility of a small manned base on the Moon by the late 1990s. Studies on the return of U.S. astronauts to the Moon have been under way in Houston for several months and NASA is focusing on launch of an unmanned lunar polar orbiter mission by the early 1990s that could provide valuable data to support establishment of a lunar base. Scientists in Johnson's Planetary and Earth Sciences Div. believe lunar exploration could proceed much like that carried out in Antarctica and that a lunar base would be a logical step toward developing systems for a U.S. manned exploration of Mars by the early to mid-2000s.

SOLAR SYSTEM EXPLORATION REPORT

NASA's Solar System Exploration Committee (SSEC) has just recommended the agency establish as a formal planetary goal a combined Mars rover/Martian surface sample return mission for launch about 1996. Planetary officials view the mission as a logical precursor to eventual manned Mars exploration. The group also recommended launch, in the late 1990's, of a comet lander to touch down on the surface of a comet, then return samples to Earth. Both the Mars rover/sample return and comet missions would benefit by space station support.

MISSION OF NASA STUDY

A NASA Advisory Council task force has completed a detailed examination of agency goals and policy and concluded: "It is inevitable that human habitation will eventually extend beyond the confines of the Earth in many ways and on a scale far larger than is currently envisioned. Although it may not now be productive to debate the specific nature of the timing of this most dramatic of all human ventures, it is appropriate to use such a venture as a distant goal to guide our search for an understanding of the solar system and to stimulate the further advance of humankind."

The 14 member team was chaired by George E. Solomon, executive vice president and general manager of TRW Electronics & Defense Sector.

Keyworth told Aviation Week & Space Technology earlier that NASA has not provided the President with a range of more visionary options due largely to the agency's focus on space station approval (AW&ST Oct. 24, p. 25).

"I thought we had given things like that to them, but apparently we have not," said NASA Administrator James M. Beggs. "If Keyworth is saying things like that, apparently we have not gotten through to them, but we have tried. We have had a number of

discussions over the last several months. His people have been over here many times hearing NASA's approach. If anything, we have been overvisory." The NASA administrator said in response to the Keyworth concerns the agency could provide more detail on areas such as the Johnson lunar base studies and would provide the White House with more detailed explanation on how a space station could be a necessary stepping stone to other U.S. space objectives.

Keyworth believes NASA has been too focused on the bureaucratic legwork toward station approval and has not been fully appreciative of the power of U.S. technology to chart an imaginative long-term space program.

"We will have to redouble our efforts and go back and explain what we are up to in greater detail," Beggs said. "We can certainly lay that out."

Beggs also said he believes NASA has made it clear to the White House that approval of a station would put a key space facility in place from which more expansive U.S. space initiatives would grow. "We do not consider the station as an end in itself," Beggs said.

Keyworth said the President wants to recapture "the vision of Apollo" but that Reagan would have a hard time making decisions toward that end with the input received from NASA to date. But Beggs responded: "Is the country ready for another Apollo type effort?—I would like to think so, but I doubt it."

"I don't see any real enthusiasm building to do Apollo-like programs," he said. "We will put down on paper our dreams but I think we have got to constrain those dreams to fit the kind of funding profile we are likely to get."

Keyworth believes, however, there is a growing upbeat attitude in the U.S. that could support such endeavors.

"To go back to an Apollo era in current dollars would cost \$16-18 billion per year," Beggs said. "That's what Apollo yearly budgets translate to in 1983 dollars. That means we would have to more than double the NASA budget and the country would have to effectively commit an additional \$10 billion a year to do it."

"I just don't think \$10 billion more a year is in the cards and I have predicated my approach to the world on the basis that I cannot get an extra \$10 billion per year," Beggs said.

"I would be happy if we could get consistently 1 percent of the federal budget, which in Fiscal 1984 would be about \$8.5 billion, and that's over a billion more than we were able to get in Fiscal 1984. If the agency had that level for the next eight to 10 years, we could certainly do the space station and make a start to go beyond the station with the orbital transfer vehicle and planning for a lunar base."

"Once we have gotten to that point by the early 21st century we would be getting back on the Moon and planning for manned Mars activities," Beggs said.

"All of this is in the cards, it just depends upon how much resources the nation wants to commit to the program," he said.

Administration officials have been meeting to define how best to present the differing space station positions to the President with Reagan's final decision expected to be made in the context of the White House National Space Strategy plan to be completed in about a month. That plan will outline specific U.S. space goals supported by the

Reagan Administration space policy declaration of July 4, 1982.

Officials who disagree with Keyworth's approach believe the station decision will be decided far more on the merits of the facility's ability to expand a U.S. manned capability in low Earth orbit by servicing other spacecraft and providing a platform for development and stimulation of commercial space operations.

They do not view the Keyworth approach as widely accepted in the White House. Keyworth, on the other hand, believes President Reagan will want any U.S. space initiative to be a program with a more powerful thrust for the future than a station alone could give.

Some NASA managers and scientists are hopeful about Keyworth's approach, especially for its potential to structure a formal U.S. program for a return to the moon or manned Mars exploration as candidate initiatives.

The Solar System Exploration Committee's recommendations for a future large new Mars and comet mission fit equally well with station justification and possible more advanced U.S. space planning.

The SSEC earlier defined a set of low cost "core" planetary mission options (AW&ST Apr. 18, p. 121). Its Mars and comet mission concepts are planned as more significant U.S. space exploration initiatives that also would push the limits of U.S. space technology and could also exploit new manned orbiting facilities.

The Jet Propulsion Laboratory has begun discussing the Mars rover/sample return options with Johnson Space Center station personnel to insure compatibility between the concepts.

One \$1.5-2 billion Mars mission concept now being studied would involve launch of a large General Dynamics Centaur stage, which would then be fueled in orbit by the station. The Centaur would not be launched fully fueled in order to stay within shuttle weight margins.

Once fueled by the station, the Centaur stage carrying the rover/return vehicle combination would fly to Mars and place the rover lander on the Martian surface.

The rover could then traverse a short distance and collect a contingency grab sample that it would deposit in the Earth return system. The rover could then be sent on much farther traverses collecting additional samples.

If the rover failed on the surface early in the mission, then the contingency sample could be returned quickly to Earth, but if the rover continued to function, then additional samples gathered from widely separated locations could be placed in the return module.

Following departure of the ascent stage, the rover could continue to explore Mars with color television and other sensors. It could also collect additional samples that would later be deposited in a second return vehicle landed for a surface rendezvous.

The samples would be recovered by the space station for examination in orbit where the search for Martian organisms could be carried out without fear of Earth contamination.

The comet mission would be less complex. No candidate comet has yet been selected.

The planetary exploration issue was such a dominant part of the Mission of NASA task force findings that some members see it as the focal point of a possible new direction in NASA.

"There was some disagreement as to whether the mission area of exploration of

the solar system should be viewed as an over-arching theme to guide the forward technological thrusts of the agency for the years ahead," Daniel J. Fink, chairman of the NASA Advisory Council, wrote Beggs.

"Some [task force members] strongly endorsed this theme as a central focus for NASA's future space activity. The majority of the task force, however, was concerned that such a specific identification would result in the diminution of other important missions," Fink said.

The formal assessment of NASA goals in the Mission of NASA report makes a strong statement on planetary exploration as it relates to long-term U.S. space goals, a possible factor in any Reagan Administration space initiative beyond the station issue itself. Keyworth has also said an approach to new U.S. space initiatives should involve a new perspective of man's ability to range throughout the solar system, an area addressed by the Mission of NASA task force.

"NASA must clearly delineate its commitment to explore and understand the solar system."

"An extended program of solar system exploration requires a broader national commitment than that which presently exists," the task force said.

"Planetary exploration has been viewed in the past either as a science project or admired for its spectacular first views of solar system objects. Execution of the program has been based on a project-to-project approach."

"If NASA is to shoulder an enduring commitment to extra-terrestrial activity, it must follow a strategy extending over a number of decades and cannot depend upon year-to-year budgetary competition nor can it depend upon budgetary exigencies in other parts of the agency."

"A commitment to a solar system exploration program requires a continuing series of interrelated flights. The program must have the status of agency policy, to be modified only after careful deliberation and consultation with Congress and with our international partners," the Mission of NASA task force said.

BOYS CLUBS OF AMERICA TO HONOR PETER MUTH AND ROBERT PRALLE

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in 1982, Stanton, one of the cities I am honored to represent in Congress, proudly unveiled a new Boys and Girls Club facility. This club features a full gymnasium, kitchen, showers, wood shop, photography lab, games area, and weight room, all for the benefit of the young people in the community.

The club is the gem of the city of Stanton, but what is truly remarkable is that this facility was built almost entirely by private citizens using private resources.

On October 10, 1983, the Boys Clubs of America will honor the two men who spearheaded the drive to build this new Stanton's Boys and Girls

Club—Peter Muth and Robert Pralle. The Boys Clubs will bestow on them, individually, its highest award, the National Medallion.

Pete Muth has been on the Stanton Boys and Girls Club Board of Directors since 1976. He led the effort to build a new club by establishing with other community and business leaders a building fund committee that raised over \$650,000. He personally contributed money, construction material, and personnel.

Pete and his wife Mary share a strong commitment to encourage the development of boys and girls through educational, recreational, and social opportunities, and we are grateful for their outstanding contribution.

Bob Pralle joined the Stanton Boys and Girls Club Board of Directors in 1979, and he joined Pete and other community leaders to build a new club. Bob's commitment included financial donations, managerial guidance, construction expertise, and personnel from his business.

Bob and his wife Helga's goal to build a better America by helping to build better young Americans could not be demonstrated more strongly than through their leadership on this project.

Mr. Speaker, the new Stanton Boys and Girls Club stands as one of the greatest private sector accomplishments for community benefit in the history of Orange County, Calif. The faith, patience, and perseverance of these two men made this dream come true, and I ask you and all my colleagues in the House to join with me in saluting the humanitarian spirit of Pete Muth and Bob Pralle.●

SENIORS ENJOY THE GOOD LIFE AT MILLS HOSPITAL'S GOOD LIFE CLUB

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, seniors in San Mateo County have the advantage of the Good Life Club—a group of seniors, aged 60 years and over, drawn together by their common desire to enjoy lifelong good health. The club is supported in its activities by the professional staff and resources of Mills Hospital in San Mateo.

The organization provides a number of services to its members—including individual health screenings and health education sessions. One club member observed that "in 70 years I have never had such a thorough screening."

Health education is an important part of the organization's goals. Earlier this year, lectures and panels were held on such diverse and relevant

topics as podiatry, dermatology, exercise, hearing, and arthritis. As a member of Good Life's Board said, "The health lectures and screenings take a positive approach to aging."

Such activities are not carried out in isolation, and the social activities are an important element of the overall program of the club. One of the members enthusiastically observed, "When my husband was so ill at Mills Hospital 10 years ago, I never wanted to come here again. Now I look forward to coming here for Good Life Club activities."

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues in the House the activities and programs developed by the Good Life Club in connection with the staff of Mills Hospital. I am particularly grateful to Jane Edison, who brought the activities of the club to my attention.

Health is a key element in enjoying the good life, and it is particularly important for seniors. The Good Life Club and the people who launched it are making an important contribution to the seniors of San Mateo County by encouraging them and helping them maintain and improve their health.●

LEBANON AND GRENADA: A PAT- TERN OF VIOLENT DIPLOMACY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, a brief review of recent events in Lebanon and Grenada reveals a very disturbing and frightening aspect of the Reagan administration's foreign policy. It is apparent that the President is inclined to use force as a means of first resort, and to use negotiation only after other means have been considered. This approach lacks wisdom, tact, and statesmanship.

The world community was stunned by the deaths of more than 200 marines in Lebanon. Two days later, news from the Caribbean indicated that 3,000 American marines and rangers had invaded Grenada with the ostensible mission of saving American lives and restoring democracy. Thus, the American people found themselves actively involved in two shooting wars in little more than 3 days.

Both tragedies clearly prove that gunboat diplomacy is alive and well in the White House. It would be difficult to arrive at this conclusion if each event were viewed in a vacuum; one could simply say that an exception to the norm was taking place. However, the use of military force is the norm with this administration. There is a common thread that links the events in Lebanon and Grenada to our commitments in El Salvador and Nicaragua. This thread is the philosophy of

an administration that seems to take great pride in using American soldiers and proxies to intervene in the internal problems of sovereign nations.

This is not international statesmanship—it is international bullying.

The administration has made vague references to maintaining the peace in Lebanon and to protecting democracy. There is, however, no peace to maintain, and little democracy in a nation that is experiencing an extremely bloody civil war.

We should not fool ourselves into believing that the introduction of neutral troops will lead to a stable Lebanon. Lebanon is not a homogeneous country. It is a mixture of different ethnic, religious, and political groups that do not trust each other, and certainly do not want more foreign troops in their country.

The invasion of Grenada was a response to the recent coup that led to the murder of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop. It is worth noting that Bishop might not have been killed if the administration had not rebuffed his overtures, and sought to isolate him.

As is so often the case, political and economic isolation merely served to push Grenada into the arms of the Cubans and Soviets. The apparently left-wing Marxists who overthrew Bishop would not have done so if Reagan had opened a line of communication with the late Prime Minister.

The long-term ramifications of this pattern of intervention will be a loss of credibility in the world community. We are projecting an image of clumsy militarism, an image which we can ill-afford. The cost of Reagan's ventures far outweighs the benefits: 200 dead marines will not bring peace to Lebanon, nor will an invasion of Grenada rectify our mistakes.

Our foreign policy is at a crossroads, the future of which is now at stake. We must aggressively pursue a policy of negotiation, not confrontation. A wise statesman talks first and shoots only as a last resort. The opposite is true of Ronald Reagan.

It is interesting to observe that the President has been most selective in deciding where to push for democracy. He has very cozy relations with some of the most brutal regimes in the world, including South Africa, Guatemala, and Chile. Our credibility definitely will suffer because of Ronald Reagan's unrestrained use of force. He is naive to think otherwise. When all is said and done, it would be in our best interest to bring the troops home.●

LIBERALS SHOULD SUPPORT
REAGAN ON GRENADA

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Los Angeles Times contained an op-ed article by Morton Kondracke entitled "Liberals Should Cheer Reagan's Action."

I commend the article to my colleagues, particularly to those on the other side of the aisle.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 2, 1983]

LIBERALS SHOULD CHEER REAGAN'S ACTION
(By Morton Kondracke)

Why so many long faces? The United States invaded Grenada to save lives, oust a gang of murderous thugs, prevent establishment of a major Cuban military base and show that America can use force successfully. We did succeed, with a minimum loss of life. I say—I say as a liberal—hooray!

Liberal congressmen and commentators seem to think that they can't be loyal to their values unless they condemn President Reagan for this action, but it is because of their values that they ought to praise it.

Liberals believe in democracy, and Reagan would deserve condemnation if he had acted to crush a democratically elected government or sought to impose a right-wing dictatorship. The Nixon Administration may have done such a thing in Chile—in spite of the movie "Missing," this has not been proved—but in Grenada the United States did nothing of the kind.

Grenada's government, if it can be called that, came to power last month in a coup that cost at least 18 lives, including that of former Prime Minister Maurice Bishop, who had himself come to power in a coup, failed to hold elections as promised and steered Grenada into the Cuban-Soviet orbit.

Under intense pressure from democratic leaders on neighboring islands, Bishop seems to have had second thoughts about his closeness to Cuba, and came to Washington to see if he could patch up relations.

Some critics contend that if Reagan had only embraced him the invasion of Grenada would not have been necessary.

The evidence seems to be to the contrary. Because Bishop showed signs of tilting ever so slightly away from Cuba, he was ousted by leftist colleagues and murdered.

That is the appropriate parallel to be drawn between Grenada and Afghanistan. Some liberal columnists have likened the U.S. invasion last week to the Soviet invasion in 1979, but when the Soviets moved in they murdered a prime minister who had shown some independence of Moscow and have kept 100,000 troops in the country to impose their will on a hostile population, using poison gas in the process.

The United States has promised to withdraw swiftly, and the people of Grenada will be able to elect their next government. So anyone who believes that democracy is better than dictatorship has to agree that the people of Grenada are better off this week than they were the week before last.

We liberals oppose the use of force on principle, and prefer the rule of law. But honest people have to admit that, unfortunately, force has its place in this world. We

do not yet live in a world of law. Even in countries where law does prevail, the use of force to defend innocent life is permitted—by police or by citizens in the absence of police. Reagan had reason to fear that the U.S. medical students on Grenada might be harmed or taken hostage—the returning students attest that they were afraid, too—and he acted to protect them.

But liberals suspect that the saving-lives argument is just a cover or a convenience, that Reagan was just itching to take a shot at some leftist regime to prove that the United States could win one.

I think so, too, but I still say—as a liberal—well done. If liberalism values self-determination, peaceful change and democracy, then liberal values are being threatened in the Caribbean and around the world. They need to be defended, and Reagan defended them.

Grenada's neighbor islands of Barbados, Dominica, Antigua, St. Lucia and St. Vincent—democracies all—felt threatened by the buildup of Grenada's military forces, by the influx of armed and trained Cuban "construction workers," by the subsequent construction of a world-class military airport and by Soviet contacts with leftist rebel groups in their own countries.

The Caribbean nations came to the United States to help defend themselves. They could have gone to the Organization of American States or the United Nations, but those groups have no ability or inclination to do more than pass resolutions of regret when force or subversion is employed.

It develops that the Caribbean countries did go to Great Britain for help before they came to the United States, but what Margaret Thatcher did when British territory was invaded in the Falklands she refused to do when a former British colony was threatening others.

If the Reagan Administration is correct, what's more, Grenada was soon to become a major Cuban-Soviet outpost in the Western Hemisphere.

Beyond the immediate case of Grenada, the U.S. invasion will warn the Soviets, Cubans, Sandinistas and other aggressive leftists that the United States has overcome its Vietnam-bred reluctance to use military power to defend its interests and its values. We have employed our power to win a quick, reasonably clean victory in a very small place, but they cannot know where we might use it later.

If that deters them from aggression, that will save lives and liberty elsewhere in the world, and that is something that liberals ought to cheer.●

TRIBUTE TO LOCAL 408 OF THE
UNITED OPTICAL WORKERS
AND SEBASTIAN RIBALDO

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, local 408 of the United Optical Workers will be celebrating its 50th anniversary on Sunday, November 6. On that day, the local will be honoring a man of noteworthy distinction, Mr. Sebastian Ribaldo, a founding member of the union.

Local 408 of the United Optical Workers was established in 1933 as an organization committed to fighting for the rights and interests of optical technicians. Over the past half century, the union has grown, and presently boasts a membership of optical technicians, opticians, and optometrists. The union assists its members in upgrading their professional certification by providing the necessary educational training. The union has also earned the gratitude of its members' children by sending them to summer camp. The United Optical Workers has been deeply involved in community activities; it has been a strong financial supporter of the United Way, and has actively participated in the American Red Cross.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute to Mr. Sebastian Ribaldo, who has been the guiding light of local 408 for the past 50 years. Today he continues to be an active force in the union. Sebastian has been an innovator of local 408's program to establish a health-referral service for the members. He has also been a leading advocate for vocational training for future optical workers. He was involved in the creation of a training program in conjunction with the New York City Board of Education, and served on the Vocational Advisory Commission for George Westinghouse High School in New York. Sebastian has also been active in professional issues outside of local 408, and served as chairperson of the National Optical Workers Council.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note the achievements of exemplary organizations and dedicated individuals, so others may emulate them. I ask that the Members of the Congress of the United States join me in congratulating local 408 of the United Optical Workers Union and Mr. Sebastian Ribaldo on their 50 years of outstanding service to optical workers, and their praiseworthy efforts on behalf of their local community.●

VIRGINIA SIMON: AN
INSPIRATION FOR PEACE

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, Virginia Simon is a community leader whose hard work, dedication, and compassion have been brought to bear on every struggle for peace, economic and social justice, and human dignity in the last 30 years. She has provided leadership to her own generation and has been an inspiration and role model for the generation that followed.

Ginny's presence is felt everywhere. The first public meeting that I attend-

ed after being sworn in as a Congressman was a large peace symposium that she organized and chaired. Her activities have continued unabated. As the threatened deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles brings us closer to the edge of the nuclear abyss, Ginny has focused her leadership and energy on mobilizing the Greater New Haven community to oppose this madness.

Ginny is a warm and compassionate woman, deeply principled, unyielding in the face of injustice, yet tolerant and endlessly patient. She knows and she has helped to convince us all that peace will come one day because our Nation—all nations—have no alternative.

I am proud to join with her many friends in the Third Congressional District to express our gratitude for what she has accomplished and what she has taught us.●

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 3533

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all Members in this body to support H.R. 3533, to require the U.S. Court of Claims to hear a number of claims which were filed against the U.S. Government by the Navajo Indian Tribe. The Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs held a hearing earlier this month on a companion bill introduced by Senator DENNIS DECONCINI.

In 1950, the Navajo Tribe filed eight separate claims against the Government pursuant to the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946. The claims alleged the Government improperly managed tribal resources and failed to deal fairly and honorably with the Navajo Tribe by not providing the educational facilities and services required by law.

However, these claims have never been heard by a U.S. court on their merits. In 1969, the claims attorney for the tribe, Harold Mott, filed an amended petition which deleted seven of the originally pleaded claims. The attorney contract with Mr. Mott required approval by both the tribe and the Secretary of the Interior for any "compromise settlement, or other adjustment of the claims." Neither the tribe nor the Justice Department have any record reflecting consultation with or approval by the Interior Secretary and the tribe. Subsequent to this action by Mr. Mott, the Indian Claims Commission and the Trial Division of the Court of Claims held that the Navajo's claims should be heard by the court on their merits. However, in 1979 the Court of Claims overturned these two earlier decisions and held

that the tribe was bound by their attorney's "voluntary dismissal" of the claims 10 years previously.

After nearly 30 years of litigation, a fair hearing on a group of legitimate claims which were timely filed by the Navajo Tribe has been denied because of the unauthorized and irresponsible action of one participant. The Indian Claims Act of 1946 was enacted to insure that claims by the Indians were given the opportunity to be heard. It seems contrary to the purposes of this law and to basic principles of fairness and equity not to allow the Navajo's claims to be judged on their merits.

The bill I introduced, H.R. 3533, carries out the intent of the Indian Claims Act by insuring that the Navajo's claims will have the hearing contemplated by the act. This legislation does not make any judgment on these claims, but it will insure that the Navajo Tribe will have the opportunity to be heard.●

H.R. 4236, NATIONAL THEATRE WEEK

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to introduce in the 97th and 98th Congresses commemorative legislation to honor the theater. The upcoming "National Theatre Week" is scheduled for June 3-9, 1984 and encompasses the entire legitimate stage in America, both amateur and professional.

Now is the time to create a permanent National Theatre Week, and I have therefore introduced H.R. 4236 which does that. This nonpartisan legislation calls upon all Americans to celebrate theatre arts every year for a week starting with the first Sunday in June.

I am bringing this to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in order to address the large role the legitimate theatre has played in the everyday life of our country and to urge you to support legislation creating a yearly National Theatre Week. Many of our larger cities already know the large impact and important role the stage plays. What is not known is what part the theatre has played in the growth of America.

It is a fact that, during his lifetime, George Washington was an avid supporter of the theatre, so much so that his support brought about the repeal of earlier Continental Congress resolutions of October 1778 banning theatre altogether. The purpose was to prepare Americans for a period of hardship and austerity. The resolutions failed miserably. In fact, more theatrical activity was engaged in than ever

before. The performances may have been illegal, however, they boosted the morale of the troops and of the citizenry. Ten days after President Washington was inaugurated in 1789, he attended the theatre with the Vice President, the Governor of New York, and several foreigners of distinction. Shortly thereafter the ban was repealed. It is also interesting to note that theatres had so much respect for our first President that on the day of his death, all theatre houses were dark.

Another touching piece of history we know is how our national anthem, the "Star Spangled Banner", came into being. All of us know about Francis Scott Key and Fort McHenry, but what most of us do not know is when the poem and music were first performed together. The Smithsonian Institution has a plaque in front of the flag that Mr. Key saw that night at Fort McHenry; it reads:

The first public performance of the words and tune together took place in a Baltimore theatre on October 19, 1814, just 1 month after the Battle of Fort McHenry.

What can a government do to honor and recognize the deeds and history that our theater has given to our country? It can perpetually preserve that part of American theater by setting aside a "Week" during which all Americans can salute the efforts of grade school, high school, university, and community and professional theaters and their contributions to the enrichment of our lives.

"National Theatre Week" has already passed the House and Senate twice on a 1 year basis in the 97th and 98th Congresses. Let these bodies of Government continue a tradition of theater support by passing H.R. 4236 to create a permanent "National Theatre Week".●

PRESENTATION OF 10,000 PETITIONS TO THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE PLIGHT OF ETHIOPIAN JEWRY

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 31, I had the Privilege of joining Rabbi Steven Kaplan of Temple Beth Torah in Fremont, Calif., Glenn Stein of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and Yehiel Yisrael of the American Association of Ethiopian Jews, in presenting over 10,000 petitions to the Congress from citizens concerned with the plight of Ethiopian Jewry.

These citizens are asking for our support of House Concurrent Resolution 107, introduced by my distin-

guished colleagues Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. FRANK. The petitions read as follows:

We, the undersigned, call on you as a member of the United States Congress to employ every means at your disposal to assist Ethiopian Jews who suffer daily from persecution and neglect. In particular we ask for your support for House (Concurrent) Resolution 107 (Solarz/Frank) and its equivalent in the Senate and for any legislation aimed at protecting the human rights and the very survival of this ancient religious minority.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to this very serious matter, and ask that they consider co-sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 107 as well.

The Ethiopian Jews, or Falashas, are severely discriminated against, and are denied the freedom to practice their religion. In addition, they are among the hardest hit of those Ethiopians affected by the drought afflicting this area of Africa. As though this were not enough, the Ethiopian Government frowns upon emigration, and these Falashas are restricted to remaining in their country subject to repression, or fleeing to neighboring countries where they must live as refugees.

It is of great importance that we do all that we can to promote human rights in all the nations of the world. This ancient Jewish community needs our support to gain its freedom, and I would like to thank Rabbi Kaplan, Mr. Stein, and Mr. Yisrael for helping to make the Members of this body aware of the plight of the Ethiopian Jews.●

PRESIDENT DEALS AUTO WORKERS A SEVERE BLOW

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has once again dealt the workers of this Nation a severe blow, particularly those associated with the auto industry that will experience a new round of unemployment as a result of the recent auto import agreement between the United States and Japan. This agreement will allow 1.85 million autos to enter the United States from Japan during the year beginning April 1, 1984, an increase of 170,000 units from the previous year. How many more will he give to the Japanese in April 1985.

This action serves two purposes. First, it serves notice to the American people that this administration is not concerned about the American worker or the adverse economic plight that the 11 to 13 million unemployed people have to endure, not to mention those who will lose their jobs as a result of this action.

Second, this agreement underlines the importance of taking immediate and positive action on the Fair Practices and Procedures in Automotive Products Act of 1983, referred to domestic content legislation. The argument presented by those in favor of the trade agreement that this is beneficial because it will decrease the Japanese share of the domestic auto market is absolutely ludicrous. The fact that domestic production is increasing should not be a basis for permitting even more Japanese vehicles to enter this country, regardless of market shares.

Mr. Speaker, what this boils down to is a matter of justice and equity for the American worker. The Reagan administration preaches free trade. If our trading partners do not believe in it, and it is clear they do not, why, then, should we?●

MISSED OPPORTUNITIES FOR CONSTITUTION-MAKING

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to receive a statement by Dr. Albert P. Blaustein stressing the importance of constitution-making in the effort to foster peace around the world. I believe Dr. Blaustein's suggestions will be helpful in our attempts to address the current state of international instability.

Dr. Blaustein, a professor of law at Rutgers University in Camden, N.J., is one of the foremost constitutional experts in the country. He has personally assisted in the drafting or rewriting of the constitutions of seven developing countries. Dr. Blaustein is also the president of Human Rights Advocates International.

I would like to share this important statement for the benefit of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

MISSED OPPORTUNITIES FOR CONSTITUTION-MAKING

(By Albert P. Blaustein)

Yesterday's tragedies in Lebanon and Grenada and yesterday's tragedies in Iran and Nicaragua provide illustrations of lost opportunities in constitution-making. Such opportunities are now knocking in El Salvador and Guatemala. We dare not let them go unheeded.

And perhaps the opportunity will knock again (or be made to knock again) in Lebanon, Grenada, Iran and Nicaragua—and in Haiti, Suriname, Uruguay, Cyprus, Bangladesh, Chad, Niger, Namibia and other world trouble spots that need new constitutions.

The same point was pointedly made in an October 21 editorial in The New York Times. Entitled "Harvest of Failure in Grenada," it provided a reminder that the then prime minister "had begun to talk of evolution toward a system that would mix some

free enterprise and constitutional democracy" with their existing socialist system. And it castigated the administration for ignoring that "opening".

As for Lebanon, its now irrelevant constitution is the 13th oldest in the world and provided the necessary equilibrium to maintain peace, order and democracy from its promulgation in 1926 until the 1975 "take-over" by the Palestine Liberation Organization. Changing world conditions and changing demographic realities likewise contributed to the irrelevancy of the 1926 charter—circumstances which call for a new constituent assembly to promulgate a new constitutional equilibrium.

For a constitution is far more than a nation's birth certificate and the blueprint/framework of its government. A constitution is also a nation's ideological manifesto, the embodiment of its values, the primary text of its educational system and its brief to the world court of public opinion. Without a constitution there can be no democracy; there can be no freedom.

And the constitution-making process can be even more significant than the constitution itself. For a constitution is also a nation's fundamental social contract. It is the formulation of national compromise and conciliation. The constitution-making process provides the forum and agenda for the discourse and dialogue necessary to reconcile the conflicting and disparate elements of a population. It fosters compromise. It forestalls the polarization which inevitably results in dictatorship, repression, revolution and counterrevolution.

Refusal of Iran's Shah and Nicaragua's Somoza to consider constitutional reform contributed to the polarization which eventually led to their own downfall and demise—and their replacement by non-democratic and (arguably) equally repressive regimes. The constitution-making process would have provided the mechanism for possible reconciliation. At a minimum, the creation of constitution commissions would have provided rallying points for democratic elements which eventually had to choose between extremist alternatives.

Yes, El Salvador has elected a constituent assembly and Guatemala plans a constituent assembly election in 1984. But the results in El Salvador (so far at least) represent a lost opportunity. The draft (so far) is pedestrian and overly legalistic—and (shocking to report) retains military tribunals with jurisdiction over the civilian population. Also (shocking to report) are provisions which make it all too easy to suspend constitutional guarantees. This is not a constitution which will win the hearts and minds of the El Salvador people.

The El Salvador draft constitution is primarily valuable as a warning to help Guatemala avoid the same pitfalls.

Promoting and fostering constitutionalism does not mean promoting Americanism or the American constitutional model. Promoting constitutionalism is not an exercise in neo-colonialism. A constitution must be autochthonous and indigenous. It must meet the special needs, wants and aspirations of the people for whom it is written.

But this does not mean that the United States cannot assist in providing constitution-making assistance. To the contrary, a nation which is so free in supplying armaments and military advisers should (at far less cost) be able to furnish constitutional libraries and constitutional experts.●

November 3, 1963

UNIVERSAL TELEPHONE SERVICE PRESERVATION ACT OF 1963

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1963

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic Caucus, I hereby submit notice of intention to request a rule on H.R. 4102, the Universal Telephone Service Preservation Act of 1963, as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which would limit the amendment process under the 5-minute rule to a specified period of time.

A PROUD WEST INDIAN

HON. RON D. LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1963

Mr. de LUIGO, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter to the editor of one of local newspapers by one of my constituents in the U.S. Virgin Islands of French descent. I believe his letter accurately reflects the feelings of Virgin Islands residents for the recent United States intervention in Grenada.

The letter follows:

A Proud West Indian

Dear BARROW: Was America right to intervene in Grenada?

Was she right to listen to the leaders of other Eastern Caribbean countries?

You're damned right she was!

As a West Indian and an American, I was never more proud of my country. Yes, I had my doubts about Korea and Vietnam. Yes, I still have my doubts when I realize the Ku Klux Klan still hounds America in their white sheets.

Neither do I condone the proliferation of nuclear armaments by my mother country. No one has won more Nobel prizes than Americans. No country has made greater strides in medicine, the sciences and computer technology than the U.S. of A. And yes, we still produce enough food to feed the world, including grain for the Soviets. We also have enough sugar if the Cubans should need any to meet their quota.

Whether or not we agreed with the politics of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop, he was popular, charismatic and a dedicated leader of his people. His fellow-Grenadians loved him because he had led them out of the tyranny of Sir Eric Gairy. When a leader of his caliber is shot down, his Cabinet and followers falling beside him in cold blood as if facing a firing squad, then it's time for action!

History will show that the greatest leaders of this era were those who were unafraid to face world opinion but took action to protect their interests, their citizens and the future of their countries.

Demonstrators are justly proud of Prime Minister Douglas Chanris for the part she played—that a woman! What a leader!

Prime Minister Edward Seaga knows the long road Jamaica has had to take back to freedom—he knows from whence he came, he made that fateful decision. Barbadians especially are a proud lot but never proud of their leader, Tom Adams.

Grenada, after all, is only 150 miles away from Barbados and it must be understood, he stated, "that the business overthrow of governments in this region will not be tolerated." Antigua, St. Kitts, Nevis, St. Vincent, the Grenadines—all agreed.

Yet, England turned her back on her former colonies. She went to the Falklands but refused to help in the Caribbean. And France, incredible France, has the gall to condemn this action. If it were Martinique or Guadeloupe, she would have begged for help. But with the imperial style on these two islands, it may not be long before ungrateful, socialist France casts her words.

So once again it's Uncle Sam to the rescue, despite the whining of some spineless politicians at home. First it was the Caribbean Basin Initiative, now the lives of our Marines and Rangers to confirm our commitment to freedom in the Caribbean. I am one proud West Indian—and a proud American. Let all West Indians stand together, put our hands on our hearts and say, "God Bless America."

CARL MARAS,
St. Thomas.

NAVY SHIPS TO CARIBBEAN—PROVOKING WAR?

HON. SALA BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1963

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues an article that appeared in the San Francisco Examiner on Tuesday reporting the movement of a fleet of nine warships to the Caribbean. The Pentagon has been vague in describing the mission of the fleet, but stated that the fleet will perform combat ready exercises, possibly off the coast of Cuba. This dangerously provocative mission, coming on the heels of the invasion of Grenada, will only further damage any peacekeeping efforts in Latin America.

The article follows:

(From the San Francisco Examiner, Nov. 1, 1963)

UNITED STATES TO SEND NINE WARSHIPS ON CARIBBEAN EXERCISES

(By John P. Walsh)

WASHINGTON.—The United States is dispatching a fleet of nine warships, including three guided missile nuclear destroyers, on a "no-notice readiness exercise" in the Caribbean.

Pentagon sources said the exercises would be off the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, but the Pentagon refused to confirm that publicly.

The large-scale maneuvers—headed by the aircraft carrier USS America—will get underway tomorrow. The ships will sail from ports in Norfolk, Va., Charleston, S.C., and Mayport, Fla.

"It is not related to the bombing in Lebanon or the invasion in Grenada," disclosed Navy spokesman Lt. Comdr. Mark Men-

hardt. But he said the 5,000-man naval task force "may go through the Caribbean" on its way to the combat readiness exercises in the South Atlantic.

Asked if the nine ships would call at Guantanamo Bay, Menhardt said: "There is that possibility. I'm not ruling out (a show of force) in the Caribbean but I can't discuss it."

Menhardt conceded this is the "last carrier group on the East Coast" of the United States.

All the others have been dispatched to Lebanon or Grenada. One major warship not included is the USS Saratoga, which is having its boilers repaired in Mayport.

The ships had been informed several days ago that they were on alert for a no-notice exercise somewhere in the Atlantic. The last no-notice exercise was in August 1962.

A Pentagon spokesman said that the exercises are not directly related to threats allegedly made by Cuban against U.S. depots in Latin America.

But obviously any U.S. display of strength—particularly one that includes an aircraft carrier, several destroyers equipped with guided missiles and a large replenishment oil tanker—is partly intended to send a message to Cuba President Fidel Castro to stop threats of terrorist acts against U.S. targets in Central America.

State Department spokesman John Hughes, dismissing that the Reagan administration suspects a Cuban connection, made public "terrorist acts" in Bolivia, Colombia and Puerto Rico, adding that "obviously Cuban instigation" of these, "if proven, would be a very serious development."

He did not, however, specify what retaliation, if any, would be taken.

Menhardt described the naval task force exercises as "designed to enhance the combat readiness of fleet units by ensuring a rapid response time for short notice sorties."

"Essentially in plain English," the Navy spokesman said, "it is intended to test our ability to respond to various contingencies to test our fleet readiness, to find out whether we can get under way in three days or less." Similar exercises were held last year in the Pacific, Menhardt said.

The task force is composed of the following ships:

From Norfolk: USS Peterson, a guided missile destroyer, USS Mississippi, a guided missile cruiser, USS Pinta, an oil tanker, USS America, an aircraft carrier, and the USS Daheyan, an aircraft carrier.

From Charleston: the USS Aulick, a frigate, and the USS Tharr, a destroyer.

From Mayport: the USS Luce, a guided missile destroyer.

THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1963

Mr. MARKEY, Mr. Speaker, two recent events, one legislative and the other regulatory, are focusing close scrutiny on the Legal Services Corporation. A bill, H.R. 2969, the Corporations Act Amendment of 1963, was introduced on April 5, 1963, to authorize

funds for the LSC. The regulatory funds, outlined in the Federal Register (August 19, 1983, 30066) proposes to revise guidelines used by the LSC to determine eligibility for legal services. Both developments have been promulgated by itself, less money proposed, after inflation, producing greater competition for fewer resources, and second, allegations of abuses in LSC funding, particularly in political activities.

The original intent of the LSC seems to me as valid today as it was in 1974 when first proposed. That is, the LSC is designed to provide financial support for legal assistance in non-minimal proceedings to persons financially unable to afford legal services. Moreover, the rationale for this agency remains compelling. As Federal, State, and local governments become increasingly complex, there are varieties of governmental and quasi-governmental support services available, directed to target populations of the poor, the sick, and the aged. To deal with this complexity, it is often necessary and beneficial to have legal advice. Moreover, the target populations are precisely those people who need the support of the Government most, but have the least financial resources to secure qualified legal assistance.

The Condition for Legal Services, although an obviously interested group, argues that the new eligibility regulations will in effect remove a significant portion of the elderly—as many as two-thirds—as well as adversely affect the eligibility of additional handicapped, poor, or unemployed people, as well as battered women, farmers, and native Americans. They cite the comparison of assets tests between the new LSC guidelines and the regulations of other, supportive agencies, and they point to the severity of the LSC eligibility.

The major objection to the LSC record focuses on the accusation that the LSC has on occasion engaged in the subsidy of blatantly political activities. These charges stem largely from Senator Harkin's subcommittee hearings and GAO report. However, the LSC has countered that organizational work and training are part of the proper jurisdiction of the LSC, and have been construed as political subsidies.

The issue, then, seems to center on whether, by regulation or legislation, the LSC should be restricted in its service, and that policing functions should be incorporated into its policies. If there are clear abuses, it seems unlikely that new regulations or a restrictive budget will cure the problem. Rather, it appears either strategy will diminish the effectiveness of the LSC by making ineligible the very people for whom the corporation was designed. Obviously, we all strive toward

better-managed Government and eradication of abuse. However, it is clear that both the new regulations and the stifling budgets will only undermine the benefits of this worthwhile program. A more appropriate alternative would be to ask for evidence of vigorous enforcement of existing guidelines, coupled with acceptable levels of funding to insure that all segments of society are offered the opportunity for equal and just treatment by all levels of government. ●

FAILURE OF U.S. POLICY IN GRENADA

HON. JOHN CONYERS, R.

OR MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1983

● MR. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as we begin to sit through the aftermath of the invasion of Grenada, we have almost overlooked the U.S. foreign policy which took U.S. marines to that tiny island in the first place. Last August 2 in the Record I pointed out that foreign policy making between Grenada and the United States had been conducted in the media, and was largely based on half-truths.

In spite of the fact that Prime Minister of Grenada, Maurice Bishop, had repeatedly asked the United States for a warning of relations between his country and ours, he was reprimanded and portrayed by the administration as an enemy of the United States.

Prime Minister Bishop came to Washington last June and spoke to the Congressional Black Caucus, many other Members of Congress, and individuals in the Reagan administration. In addition, he addressed the sixth annual dinner of TransAfrica, and emphasized his experience for a constructive U.S. foreign policy toward, not only Grenada, but toward other Caribbean and Central American governments, which came to power after defeating regimes commonly regarded as oppressive and undemocratic. He emphasized his determination to move toward holding elections in Grenada.

After Prime Minister Bishop returned home from this visit, he wrote to me and thanked me for meeting with him, and once again expressed his willingness for peace and harmony in the Caribbean.

It is, I think, appropriate and timely that selected parts of Prime Minister Bishop's speech to TransAfrica be included in the Congressional Record, along with his last letter to me, so that we may ask ourselves if the tragic deaths of Americans, Grenadians, and Cubans could have been avoided this past week in Grenada. I would hope, also, that these comments will be carefully considered and reflected upon as we watch the escalation of increased

hostility toward other regimes in Central America.

REMARKS OF Prime Minister Maurice Bishop's Speech to TransAfrica, June 4, 1983

Distinguished Members and friends of TransAfrica, I am greatly honored, and greatly moved, to find myself here tonight in the presence of a gathering of some of the finest, smart and dignified of the heroic Black American people.

The links between our people and the 30 million black people of America go far back into the chronicles of the European arrival on our ancestral land and the continued transportation of our ancestors to the Americas.

The struggle of the black American people has been a constant source of inspiration to the liberation struggles of the peoples of the world. In every corner of the earth where people are struggling or have struggled to win their freedom, the names of your great leaders are honored, and people draw strength from your struggles and your victories.

The history, the problems and the aspirations of the masses of people of Africa, the Caribbean and Black America are inextricably similar, and that is why TransAfrica is an organization with so much meaning and relevance to us all.

I must also say that our country, Grenada, with the same fierce determination as that of African states and Black America, has embraced Africa's number one priority, full unconditional liberation and self-determination for Southern Africa.

But soldiers and bayonets, to be very open and frank, without workers to about the Southern African struggle is not just the brutal, aggressive and expansionist policies of South Africa, but also the attitude of the powerful U.S. administration and the conditions of misery and suffering in that part of the world. The warm and friendly relations between the United States and South African government in defiance of the U.S. is really an affront to humanity. The open hostility of the United States Administration to Grenada while at the same time embracing South Africa underlines the serious hypocrisy of the present Administration.

In Central America what we are experiencing is the extension of the same attitude that again negates the interests and aspirations of the people of this region.

Consider the case of Nicaragua, whose people have suffered so much during this century from military invasion of their country, through the many years of brutal and corrupt Somoza dynasty, to this day of CIA backed and trained counter-revolutionaries and mercenaries. What crimes have the Nicaraguans committed? The only crime that they are guilty of is the same committed by the American colonists in their war of independence: the struggle for justice and self-determination.

At home in Grenada, our people have never failed to contrast the poor state of relations between the United States and Grenada today with the embrace that the United States gave to the United States before the revolution.

Up till very recently, our requests for dialogue have been met consistently with economic, political, diplomatic and military pressures on our young revolution. From the very first days of coming to power, the United States pursued a policy which showed no respect for our national pride

and aspirations, and sought constantly to bring the Revolution to its knees.

We have faced tremendous adverse propaganda, especially against our new international airport project. We faced military pressure in August 1981 from a naval exercise called "Operation Amber and Ambardines" designed to intimidate Grenada. Our request for exchange of Ambassadors has not been responded to.

The United States has continued to raise the issue of free elections, but the new Grenada, like your country, was born in a great revolutionary act of liberation. The American Revolution gave itself a period of thirteen years to consolidate before holding the first elections. In South Africa there is no electoral process for Blacks, who are the majority of the population. And, let us recall that despite the fact that the government of President Salvador Allende of Chile, was duly elected and instituted yet none of this deterred a previous U.S. Administration from violently overthrowing this regime.

Sisters and brothers and friends, despite all of these clear inconsistencies, these painful and damaging actions against Grenada, this clear pattern of unfriendliness, we remain fervently committed to the normalization and improvement of relations with your government, for this is in the best interests of our two peoples. In these very days we are engaged in an earnest search for meaningful dialogue at appropriate levels and as far as Grenada is concerned we are willing to go into talks with an open mind and without preconditions. For us the true bottom line is—let us talk now."

JUNE 7, 1983.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: On behalf of the People's Revolutionary Government and people of Grenada, I want to personally thank you for facilitating my recent visit to the United States.

I am confident that my visit to Washington, Detroit and New York and my meetings with yourself and other members of the Congressional Black Caucus will go a long way towards improving the relations between our two countries. I am also convinced that my visit has gone a long way towards further cementing the natural alliance between our black sisters and brothers in our two countries.

As you know, we in Grenada are firmly committed to peace and harmony in our American region. Equally we are convinced that this commitment cannot become a reality unless the nations of our hemisphere are committed to the principles of respect for sovereignty and non-interference into each others internal affairs. As we struggle for this principle, I know that we can look to you and your colleagues for firm support.

In closing I extend to you and your colleagues in the Black Caucus an open invitation to visit us at any time.

Sincerely,

MAURICE BISHOP,
Prime Minister.●

A RAY OF HOPE

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of National Drug Education Week, I would like to point to the many parents across the country who are constructively addressing the tragedy of drug and alcohol use among our young people.

Although drug use is not a new problem in this country, it has become frighteningly epidemic. More and more children are experimenting with drugs and alcohol at a younger and younger age to the extent that drugs and alcohol together have become the leading cause of death among American teenagers. Some 16,000 young people were killed in a recent year in alcohol-related traffic fatalities alone; 50 percent of the 5,000 teenage suicides last year were attributed to alcohol and pills.

A ray of hope in this unfortunate situation is that parents around the country are courageously facing the possibility that their own children are being robbed of a normal and healthy childhood through the specter of drug and alcohol abuse. At least 5,000 parent peer groups have been organized and are working energetically to deter the use of alcohol and drugs among their communities' young people.

Hopefully the determined efforts and successes of these concerned parent groups will be built upon through their sponsorship of an upcoming public television broadcast of "The Chemical People," a two-part series designed to bring parents and citizens together and offer them guidelines for helping young people. Last night and on November 9, communities in my district will be among 12,000 communities around the country gathering to watch this broadcast. Program 1 will supply hard information about the alcohol and drug abuse problem and lead to a discussion of the local situation. Program 2 will focus on how other parents, schools, and neighbors are fighting drugs and alcohol and provide the basis for the establishment of a community task force.

Recently, the director of "The Gateway" a comprehensive treatment program for chemically dependent adolescents, Dr. Joseph Novello, testified before a crisis intervention hearing of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. In his testimony, Dr. Novello pointed out that:

No one single group or institution is at "fault" (for the epidemic of teenager drug abuse): not the Federal Government, not parents, not the schools, not the media, not

even psychiatrists—and surely not the teenagers themselves.

He went on to stress, however, that: If none of us stands alone as the problem—we must stand together as the solution.

I would like to applaud the dedicated individuals in my district and across the country who have committed themselves to be part of this solution. They have translated their love for their children into an honest and determined campaign for their future. Their efforts should serve as an inspiration to involvement for us all.●

ACID RAIN

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent remarks of John D. Feehan, chairman of the board and president of Atlantic City Electric Co. I think Mr. Feehan's comments are worthy of our consideration as we deal with the issue of acid rain.

His remarks follow:

REMARKS OF JOHN D. FEEHAN

My name is John Feehan and I am Chairman of the Board and President of Atlantic City Electric Company which serves the electric energy needs of the Southern third of this State. In recent years I have also served as President of the New Jersey Utility Association, as Chairman of the Board of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, as Chairman of the New Jersey Capital Budgeting and Planning Commission and as a Director of the Governor's Management Improvement Project. I mention these other activities to suggest that my remarks come from a broader perspective than simply that of a utility chief executive.

I want to commence by wishing you a "Happy Anniversary." Ten years ago, almost to this exact date, the Arab Oil Embargo commenced. That event had a worldwide and continuing impact on energy prices and rampant inflation. In New Jersey we saw a major disruption in energy supply and a dramatic increase in the cost of all forms of energy, including electricity. Was that event unpredictable—my answer to that is a resounding "No."

In 1971 I testified before this very New Jersey Clean Air Council when New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection was hell-bent on driving the last trace of coal out of New Jersey by its very stringent particulate, smoke and SO₂ regulations. We warned that we were being forced to use low sulfur overseas oil. I testified in 1971 as follows:

"In the current fuels crisis, the complete elimination of a basic fuel source (coal) is pure folly and places this State, the East Coast and the Nation in an extremely vulnerable position." "—85 percent of the East Coast oil comes from foreign sources on foreign ships under foreign flags. This oil supply is subject to disruption due to the volatile Mid-East situation, tanker shortages, strikes in transportation, port tie-ups,

etc. On January 24, 1971 the Shah of Iran declared that the 10 major oil-producing countries, members of OPEC, will consider shutting off oil to the West if there is a breakdown in talks with international oil firms on higher prices."

I went on to say: "Elimination of coal and complete dependence on foreign oil also subjects us to uncontrolled price escalation by the producing nations and by the oil companies. We will have lost all flexibility in fuels and all competition. Already we have seen oil prices at our plants in 1970 go from \$1.83/bbl to \$4.67/bbl."

"Placing the Nation in this position of dependence and vulnerability could result in our being brought to our knees by a cutoff of this foreign oil or even worse, being drawn into an international confrontation and conflagration because this lifeblood has been cut off."

"In this continuing fuels crises, flexibility in fuel supply is the essential ingredient in order to protect ourselves. For this reason we beseech you not to drive coal completely out of the State with these proposed changes—"

No one would listen to that warning in 1971 and New Jersey and the Nation went pell mell on its path to greater dependence on overseas oil. Coal was essentially banned in New Jersey so that by the time the Arab Oil Embargo hit 10 years ago this week, fully 75 percent of the electricity in our service area came from overseas oil.

With the embargo, that 1970 price for oil of \$1.83/bbl went to \$12/bbl. With the actions of the Ayatollah Khomeini in 1980 the price of oil went over \$30/bbl and is currently at \$29/bbl. The present price of oil is 16 times higher than it was in 1970! This escalation in oil prices continues to plague this Nation, particularly in our balance of payments problems.

These events disrupted the coal market as well. In 1970 coal delivered to our system cost about \$9/ton. Today we are paying around \$49/ton, a fivefold increase.

As a result of these increases in fuel costs and the worldwide inflation they spawned, the price of electricity in New Jersey has risen from 2½¢/kilowatt-hour in 1970 to 8.6¢/kilowatt-hour in 1983, a three-fold increase.

Please forgive me if I seem to dwell too much on these past events but I think it is important that we not lose sight of the lessons we should have learned when the OPEC'ers and the Ayatollah picked up their two-by-fours and hit us over the head. We are still vulnerable to worldwide disruption of oil supply and escalation in oil prices. We could easily leave this meeting to be greeted by the news that Iran has closed the Straits of Hormuz in response to Iraqi airborne missile attacks on their oil facilities.

We have made some progress as a Nation in reducing our dependence on overseas oil but we are still vulnerable and our balance-of-payments (largely oil driven) are still a major economic problem. At Atlantic Electric, we have made substantial progress in reducing our dependence on overseas oil. By greater use of coal in our own generating units, by greater use of coal-fired energy from the Midwest and by the advent of nuclear power, we have reduced our dependence on overseas oil to less than 20 percent. A remarkable achievement, going from 75 percent dependent to less than 20 percent dependent! This was accomplished by dint of great effort, major capital expenditures and a conviction that we had to do our share to get out from under the blackmail

of foreign oil. In some cases we practically doubled the investment at our generating facilities to achieve this result in an environmentally sound manner.

"So what is the point of all this, John"? The point is that Congress and the Nation is being stampeded into doing something drastic about acid rain. There are still legitimate questions about the extent of the problem, the contributions of men and nature, and the effectiveness of proposed cures. But there is tremendous emotional and political pressure to do something.

I want to applaud you for your scientific approach in these hearings in order that we might get better facts before we plunge headlong into an extremely expensive program which can have drastic impacts on New Jersey and the Nation. Many of the proposed programs are terribly expensive and they will impact the people of New Jersey. If we "clobber" the Midwest with this program, we will see sharply higher costs for electricity in New Jersey, as Mr. Geiger will testify. Worse than that, we will see greater use of foreign oil with all that portends in terms of security, inflation, international blackmail and balance-of-payments.

The greatest irony of the situation is that the reason we can get low-cost coal energy from the Midwest is because that area is so economically depressed with the auto industry, heavy machinery and steel all in dire straits. If we impose higher electricity costs on that area because of hastily and ill-conceived acid rain measures, we will only add to the uncompetitiveness of American industry. And that is the bottom line—sooner or later we have to sell things overseas or our whole economy collapses. To the extent we needlessly make this Nation less competitive, we greatly aggravate our balance-of-payments problems. To the extent such an acid rain program forces us to overseas oil, our balance-of-payments problem gets even further impacted.

My message to you today: be a voice for reasonableness. Be a voice for getting solid facts before we plunge headlong into programs which could waste billions on the wrong solution to what is at best a poorly perceived problem. Be a voice for reasonableness—we really don't want to come back in another 10 years and go through all of this again!

Thank you for listening. Thank you for your efforts to get the facts.●

DECOMMISSIONING CIVIL RIGHTS

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, last week, while the Nation's attention was focused on the marine troop fatalities in Lebanon and the invasion of Grenada, the President told three members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights he was terminating them before the future of the Commission and the fate of his own nominees could be resolved by Congress. The President's action—coming after numerous bipartisan attempts to accommodate the administration, without undermining the Commission's independence—should

be viewed as one in a series of steps to reverse the Nation's civil rights progress over the past 30 years since Brown against Board of Education. Let us look at the Reagan civil rights record in the area of higher education:

In February 1981, the Department of Education tried to exempt from existing regulatory coverage and civil rights requirements more than 3,500 postsecondary institutions which receive and benefit from student aid under Title IV of the Higher Education Act. This would be done in order to prevent a Federal court decision upholding existing enforcement responsibilities. The Department's proposal to the Justice Department would have ceased counting Pell Grants and Guaranteed Student Loans as Federal assistance for purposes of Title VI of the CRA, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

In January 1982, the Treasury Department abandoned a 10-year policy of denying tax exemptions to racially discriminatory private schools, including colleges and universities. In defending its new policy before the Supreme Court, the Administration urged the Court to reverse two lower court decisions against Bob Jones University and the Goldsboro Christian School. Fortunately, the Court rejected the Administration's arguments and its new policy of providing tax benefits to those who discriminate.

Recently, in August, 1983, the Justice Department, in the government's brief in *Grove City College v. Bell*, took the novel legal position that private funds loaned to a student to attend college—federally guaranteed and subsidized—can only be traced to the student aid office at the recipient institution. This ignores the obvious fact that the loan pays tuition and fees which support every aspect of the institution.

These few examples in higher education barely scratch the surface of the Reagan civil rights retreat in housing, education and employment.

Now the Reagan administration wants to decommission civil rights. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is the oldest civil rights agency in the Federal Government, created during the Eisenhower administration by the Civil Rights Act of 1957. It is an "• • • independent bipartisan, fact-finding agency" with no real power except to investigate the facts and report its findings to the Congress and to the President. Because the Commission is an independent agency and because it reports to the executive and the legislative branches of Government, its recommendations over the years have carried great weight. As former Commission Chairman, Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, CSC wrote in the *Notre Dame Lawyer*:

From the beginning, the Commission on Civil Rights has been considered an "independent" agency, although the word does not appear in the Civil Rights Act of 1957 which established the Commission as an agency "in the executive branch of the Government." The Act did endow the Commission with bipartisanship, one of the attributes of independence. If no more than three of the six Commissioners can be members of the same party, the President is not

expected to control the Commission. Bipartisanship was further strengthened in 1964 by an amendment providing that even Commission subcommittees shall be nonpartisan.

The Eisenhower administration proposal, which became the Civil Rights Act of 1957, called for a bipartisan, executive Commission. . . .

The source of the proposal was the 1947 report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights (the Truman Committee) which recommended the establishment of a permanent Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Office of the President and the simultaneous creation of a Joint Standing Committee on Civil Rights in the Congress.

President Truman sent a civil rights bill to Congress in 1948 calling for both of these measures, but it failed to pass. In the 1956 and 1957 civil rights bills sent to Congress by President Eisenhower, only an executive commission was proposed. Senator Paul Douglas, one of the legislation's sponsors, explained that fear of Southern resistance led to abandonment of the "Congressional Committee" proposal. That abandonment probably gave rise, however, to the idea of a bipartisan rather than a purely "executive" commission. The influence of the Joint Congressional Committee concept might also explain why the Commission was required to report to the Congress as well as to the President.

The current political debate surrounding the extension of the Commission's life is troubling. The President apparently wants to remove three current Commissioners and appoint people who agree with him on school desegregation and affirmative action policy—a move which undermines the Commission's independence. Other Chief Executives have disagreed with the Commission—Presidents Kennedy and Nixon to name just two—but none of them have tried to remake the agency in their own political image. That is not what Congress intended in 1957, when it gave the President the power of appointment, nor what it will permit in 1983 if the President abuses that power.

The Commission's independence and its dual reporting responsibility are essential to its mandate as the Nation's conscience on civil rights issues. The President and Congress may not like what the Commission has to say, but we surely ought to listen.

Since President Reagan has committed his administration to reversing the civil rights policies of three Republican and three Democratic Presidents—which enjoyed bipartisan support in the Congress and were consistently upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States—it is even more important to have a Commission on Civil Rights. That Commission must maintain all of the three essential qualities envisioned in the 1957 Act:

Independence;
Reporting membership; and
Reporting responsibility to the executive and legislative branches of Government.

It should also have a legislative mandate to file amicus curiae or friend of the Court briefs in civil rights cases

before the Supreme Court. If these principles cannot be included in legislation which can be enacted before the current Commission expires, I hope the Judiciary Committee and the House leadership will commit themselves to passing new legislation early in the next session.●

VOTES ON OCTOBER 31, 1983

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, while traveling from my district, I—along with many other Members—missed two votes that were not anticipated to be scheduled.

Had I been present, I would have voted aye on the motion by Mr. BROWN to instruct the conferees to oppose turning over \$20 million to the Democratic and Republican parties to promote democracy abroad.

The House on June 9 approved an amendment eliminating any contribution of tax funds to either political party for this purpose. I do not think that subsidizing either the Democratic or Republican parties is an appropriate use of tax money.●

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 409

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution to prohibit the Department of the Navy or any Federal agency from using funds to dispose of the Naval Arctic Research Laboratory near Barrow, Alaska, except under certain circumstances.

The Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, or NARL as it is called, is a research facility located on the North Slope of Alaska. It is adjacent to the village of Barrow, Alaska, and directly west of our enormous oil fields at Prudhoe Bay. For years, the Department of the Navy has conducted research from NARL, using the facilities to stage research expeditions which sought to teach us more about man's ability to function in an arctic climate. The Navy has indicated its interest in closing its program on arctic research, and is planning to spend some \$10 to \$20 million to dismantle this physical structure. This resolution, identical to a Senate passed measure, would prohibit the Department of the Navy from spending money to dismantle a valuable structure.

In addition to saving the taxpayer money, my resolution would allow some time for alternative uses for the

facility to be developed. The village of Barrow has expressed an interest in acquiring the structure, for possible use as a vocational training center or as a staging area for research activities conducted by public and private interests. As you know, the Arctic is a virtual treasurehouse of natural resource wealth, as evidenced by Prudhoe Bay, North America's largest oil-producing structure. Yet the arctic is also a very fragile ecosystem, in which indigenous peoples utilize nature to provide for their subsistence lifestyle. Any such exploitation of natural resources, therefore, must be done in a way that allows the continued protection of the environment. Toward that end, the Senate has passed a bill to establish an Arctic research policy, designed to learn more about the Arctic and man's part in the Arctic. This bill is presently before the Science and Technology Committee in the House, where it is expected to be acted upon in the immediate future. With the possible enactment of this legislation, the facility on the North Slope of Alaska may provide a low cost alternative to construction of a new physical plant, and therefore, should be retained at least until an appraisal of the economics of such use is ascertained. This resolution would direct that some time be bought for the facility during consideration of the legislation, while at the same time preserving the options for its future use and slowing the burden on the taxpayer. I would hope that the House would act quickly, as did the Senate, in adopting this prudent initiative, and I ask that the bill be inserted in the RECORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

A RARE COMBINATION

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that one finds a person whose physical talents and mental prowess clearly stand out above his peers. For those who possess such unique gifts, a Rhodes scholarship, a wide choice of careers, and the admiration of friends and the public await.

I am fortunate to have one of these individuals as a constituent. Despite his young age of 13, Nolan Glantz of Crompond, N.Y., is already a men's champion doubles racketball player. His ability is too great for others his age.

Aside from his formidable athletic skills, Nolan also is a gifted math student. On the scholastic aptitude test for math, normally administered to 17- and 18-year-olds in 11th and 12th grade, Nolan last December at the age of 12 scored 700 out of a possible 800.

He is a national champion in the "Olympics of the Mind" competition.

Recognizing his enormous talent, this week's Sports Illustrated published an article on Nolan's accomplishments. The article follows:

A MOST PRECOCIOUS LAD

In the interest of extolling exceptional athletes regardless of age, we hereby introduce Nolan Glantz, an eight-grader at the Lakeland (N.Y.) Middle School. Nolan is all of 5'1" and 100 pounds, but last summer he won the American Amateur Racquetball Association championship for boys 12-and-under by scores of 15-1 and 15-3. Nolan, who can drive the ball a stunning 106 mph, also shared the doubles crown for the second time. He has won any number of other titles, including the New York State Open Men's B doubles.

Nolan is an academic star, too. He's in the National Junior Honor Society, was the top point-scorer on the school math team and has received get-acquainted letters from MIT and Cal Tech. Last December, while a seventh-grader, he scored 700 of a possible 800 on the math SAT, a test ordinarily administered to high school juniors and seniors, in Johns Hopkins' search for mathematically precocious youngsters. Along with his sister Anita, and three other Lakeland Middle School students, he participated in the Olympics of the Mind competition, and his team won the local, state and national titles in its division. He has played first cello in the school orchestra and now plays first violin.

Nolan, who recently turned 13, is planning to become a racquetball professional within the next two years so as to play in the Men's Pro division. He already has two sponsors, Footjoy shoes and Ektelon racquets. He more than holds his own now against most adults on the court, as witness the end of this poem that Louis Fafella, 35, wrote after getting drubbed by the lad:

Embarrassed by this carrotop
I quickly ran and hid,
And the only thing that I could say:
"Who was that rotten kid?"

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of H.R. 1234, the Fair Practices in Automotive Products Act, I voted present on the amendments and on final passage of the bill.

Before I came to the House of Representatives, I was in the automobile business and my family still operates a dealership in Dade County, Fla. Because of my family's involvement in authorized dealerships of both American and foreign cars, I felt that my voting on this particular bill might be considered a conflict of interest. I therefore voted present.●

**HILLCREST WELCOMES THE
CHIEF RABBIS OF ISRAEL**

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to draw the attention of my colleagues to a unique event which will take place in my district on Wednesday, November 9. My pleasure stems from the fact that it is a rare opportunity, indeed, for a community to host and extend greetings to the two Chief Rabbis of the State of Israel.

I, therefore, welcome the opportunity to mark this occasion by saluting Rabbi Avraham Shapira and Rabbi Mordechai Eliyahu on their first official journey to these United States, and on their joint participation in a "Torah Conclave" held in their honor by my constituents of the Young Israel of Hillcrest.

Mr. Speaker, it was the great American statesman Benjamin Franklin who suggested, "A good example is the best sermon." Our guests are men of faith and scholarship whose exemplary intellectual and spiritual achievements have earned them the prestigious position to which their peers have elected them.

Together, the Chief Rabbis portray the quintessential qualities of religious harmony and mutual respect, while individually each nobly represents the rich heritage of his ancestral traditions.

Rabbi Mordechai Eliyahu, known as the Sephardic Rishon Le-Tzion, is a descendent of a famous Jerusalemite Kabbalistic family. He received his ordination at the Porat Yosef Rabbinic Seminary, and for many years served as Justice of the Rabbinic Court of Jerusalem. Rabbi Eliyahu is widely recognized as a Halachic authority.

Rabbi Avraham Shapira, the Ashkenazic Chief Rabbi, is a sixth-generation Jerusalemite who was ordained by the leading rabbis of the previous generation. Currently he heads a rabbinic seminary, and also serves on the Rabbinical Supreme Court and Chief Rabbinic Council of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, in these days of international strife, it behooves us to pause and be inspired by these men of peace and erudition, for, indeed, their example of coexistence is greater than any sermon. I, therefore, call on all Members of Congress to join me in this tribute to the worthy Rabbis and in wishing them success in all their future endeavors.

I also wish to take this opportunity to acknowledge the sponsoring organizations whose efforts make the Rabbis' visit possible: Vaad HaRabbonim of Queens, Mizrahi-HaPoel HaMizrahi, the Young Israel of Hill-

crest, and its spiritual leader, Rabbi Simcha Krauss.●

**SOLARZ PAYS TRIBUTE TO A
SCHOLAR: PROFESSOR CACIAGLI**

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, our office has met with, and learned from, a distinguished member of the International Meeting for the Development of Neuroscience, Prof. Francesco Caciagli. Since he has been traveling in the United States recently, I wanted to pay tribute to him.

Professor Caciagli has been performing extensive research on neurotransmitters in the cyclic nucleotide systems and to date has 40 publications to his credit.

He received his medical degree from the University of Pisa in 1971. Professor Caciagli has participated in research studies in Pisa, Ferrara, and Chieti, Italy, and in Israel.

In 1979, the professor organized the Italian Society of Neuropsychopharmacology and has remained an active member. He is also a member of the Italian Society of Biology and is a full professor at the University of Chieti Medical College.

Of Professor Caciagli's work, I am reminded of the words of Lord Acton who said of men of science:

Theirs is the logic of discovery, the demonstration of the advance of knowledge and the development of ideas, which, as the earthly wants and passions of men remain almost unchanged, are the charter of progress, and the vital spark in history.●

**RESTON AND LEWIS SEE TIME
RUNNING OUT FOR U.S.-
SOVIET NEGOTIATIONS**

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, at the height of tension (and euphoria in public opinion) over the invasion of Grenada, I hope we will keep in mind the seriousness and the danger of failing to talk with the Soviet Union.

It is striking that both James Reston and Anthony Lewis wrote major editorials on this subject within a day of each other. I hope all my colleagues would read and ponder the truths of these articles in the light of today's events.

[From the Post-Gazette, Oct. 3, 1983]
**TIME IS RUNNING OUT FOR NUCLEAR ARMS
 TALKS**

(By James Reston)

UNITED NATIONS.—The relations between the United States and the Soviet Union have been so bad lately that there's a tendency here at the United Nations to believe that Yuri Andropov has abandoned hope of reaching a compromise on the control of nuclear weapons with President Reagan, and will therefore wait and maneuver for a change of administration in Washington.

If so, this may be the worst idea the Soviets have had since they shot down the South Korean plane. There are now over 400 days until the U.S. presidential election of 1984, and time is not on the side of compromise or common sense.

Every few days, while Reagan and Andropov and other politicians exchange insults, the technicians on both sides add one or two more nuclear missiles to their arsenals.

In a private conversation with a few reporters here the other day, President Mitterrand of France deplored the "politics of passion." And he reminded the General Assembly of the United Nations that each of the two superpowers "has a nuclear system of 2,000 to 3,000 launchers, carrying 8,000 to 9,000 nuclear warheads . . . which could reach and destroy each other seven or eight times over." That, he thought, was more than enough.

As to the theory that things will get better if Washington and Moscow only wait for new and more sensible leaders to come to power, this is a shared illusion unsupported by history.

Maybe there was something to it in the period between Stalin and Nikita Khrushchev in Moscow, but since then, not much. Washington waited for a long time, watching the decline of Leonid Brezhnev's health, and hoping that maybe a new generation, better educated and informed about the West, just might believe that the two major nuclear powers had more to gain by cooperation than by confrontation.

If anything, things have become worse, and the troubling silence of Andropov during most of the Korean plane controversy has raised doubt about whether he's commanding the military or vice versa.

As to the idle chatter here in the U.N. delegates' lounge about the Soviets trying to influence the coming U.S. presidential election, nothing could be sillier. For every time the Soviets have tried to fiddle with public opinion in democratic elections, knowing so little about it, they have failed—most recently in the West German election. And obviously, the more they tried to defeat Reagan by opposing him and waiting for somebody else, the more they would provoke him to run and assure his re-election.

Fortunately, there are one or two signs of caution on both sides. In his speech here, Reagan made a few amendments to his original nuclear proposals and said: "The door to an agreement is open. It is time for the Soviet Union to walk through it."

Andropov, in reply, resented what he termed Reagan's "malicious attacks" on the Soviet Union but he didn't slam the door. "We do not base our policy on emotions," he said, and concluded that the arms race could still be brought under control.

But time is now an important factor. There are only a few short weeks for negotiations at Geneva before the United States will be deploying its new nuclear cruise and Pershing 2 missiles in West Germany, Britain and Italy.

Also, coming into the last quarter of the year, before the presidential election campaign begins in earnest at the outset of the new year, there is just a brief chance now for serious negotiations. The atmosphere is not good, but it will be harder to reach an accommodation after both sides put more missiles closer to one another, and after the presidential campaign begins in 1984.

The White House seemed to recognize the danger of loitering into a renewal of the Cold War. It did not ignore Andropov's rejection of Reagan's "Open Door" proposal, but in an official statement, said:

"While we disagree profoundly on the way human society should be organized . . . we know that we must live on the same planet and that peace is imperative to mankind if it is to survive."

So we'll see in the short time that's left before the missiles are moved closer to one another whether the Soviets are going to negotiate or wait for the next election.

Everything that can be said by Moscow and Washington against one another has been said over and over again. What we need now is a little silence, and a chance for serious nuclear negotiations at Geneva before the technicians produce more weapons and the presidential candidates take over.

HAS ANTI-SOVIET TALK GONE TOO FAR?

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON.—The Reagan policy for dealing with the Soviet Union—bristling words and an all-out arms race—is flourishing as never before. The administration has succeeded in using the Korean airliner incident to intensify anti-Soviet rhetoric and win congressional approval of an array of new weapons.

But a funny thing has happened. At the moment of its fullest application, the policy has proved bankrupt. A number of administration officials, realizing the dangers, are alarmed. Even Ronald Reagan may have an inkling.

The event that put a chill on Washington was the statement by Yuri V. Andropov on relations with the United States. Putting his personal imprimatur on the position, the Soviet leader painted the administration's policy as unrelentingly hostile and implied that there was no point in trying to do business with such a government. Any "illusions" of "a possible evolution for the better" in its policy, he said, had been "finally dispelled."

The Andropov statement caused concern for evident reasons. It is one thing to give sermons about the evil of the Soviet system. It is quite another to wake up and realize that the leaders of the other superpower no longer think it worth talking to you about matters engaging the fate of mankind.

If meaningful communication breaks down, the consequences could be immediate and severe on the question of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. The United States is scheduled to begin flying Pershing 2 missiles to West Germany in about six weeks. Many Europeans have been hoping for last-minute progress in the Soviet-American arms talks that would forestall the deployment. But the Andropov statement turns that possibility from remote to just about nonexistent.

Once the deployment of Pershings and cruise missiles begins, the Russians may take some threatening action in response. They might deploy missiles in East Germany. They might move nuclear-armed submarines closer to the American East Coast. It takes no great imagination to see how such

steps could heighten the present mood of confrontation and increase the risk of fatal misadventure.

A perception of such danger seems suddenly to have struck the Reagan administration. Secretary of State George P. Shultz has reportedly told colleagues that the strident and prolonged American criticism of the Soviets over the downing of the Korean airliner may have had unintended consequences.

But only someone grossly uninformed about the Soviet Union could have failed to appreciate how the Russians might react to the words used by this administration—and not just since the incident. For two and one-half years Reagan has directed the harshest language at Soviet leaders, really denying their legitimacy. And they do care, morbidly, about attacks of that kind.

The blithe ignorance of the administration in its use of rhetoric has been matched in its notion has been matched in its notion of frightening the Soviet Union into submissiveness by an arms race. The Russians have matched every previous American weapons buildup, or exceeded it, and there is no reason to think that this arms race will end differently.

Dealing with the Soviet Union is enormously difficult and frustrating. Its system is cruel, its reactions verging sometimes on the paranoid.

But what is the alternative to negotiation? Can anyone really believe that keeping its foreign minister out of New York will impress the Soviet Union? Other proposals advanced by the American right are equally irrelevant. Insult, bluster and threat do not work. No, there is no alternative to the hard work of talking—and trying to define the common interest, theirs and ours, in survival.

That is the point of a remarkable article by George Kennan in the current issue of *The New Yorker*. The piece is a *cri de coeur* from a man who has devoted his life to the problem of dealing with the Soviets.

For all its conspiratorial nature, Kennan says, the Soviet regime has a deep interest in avoiding war. But the Reagan administration acts as if that reality did not exist, as if the Russians were 10 feet tall, as if they had no problems, as if they could be stopped from world conquest by only military force. Then he writes:

"This view is, if one will forgive my language, simply childish, inexcusably childish, unworthy of people charged with the responsibility of conducting the affairs of a great power in an endangered world."

It is a more dangerous world today than it was on Jan. 20, 1981. Ordinary communication with the Soviet Union has virtually ceased. Our leaders talk about the relationship more and more in military terms—to the point, Mr. Kennan says, where the ordinary citizen "is compelled to conclude that some sort of military showdown is the only conceivable denouement." ●

A TRIBUTE TO DR. GERALD E. THOMSON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the very fine work of Dr.

November 3, 1983

Gerald E. Thomson, Lambert professor of medicine, College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University.

Dr. Thomson is part of the rare breed who are committed to the service of others. He is a man of high character who has devoted his life to physiological research, patient care, kidney research, and the supervision of the education of young doctors. His contribution to medical science has been invaluable, and he richly deserves the recognition of his peers.

To this end, Dr. Thomson will be recipient of the National Medical Award. It will be presented by the Kidney Foundation of New York/New Jersey in honor of his career of public service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

This award is among the highest achievements in his profession, and will be presented to him on January 21, 1984, in New York.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Thomson is also the director of medicine at Harlem Hospital Center. I mention this to point out how well rounded and dedicated he really is.

He has done as much as is humanly possible to improve his profession. He is committed to the ideals of medical science, and is an example that young doctors should strive to emulate. It is in this spirit that I rise to recognize his dedication and service.●

30921

VOTE ON H.R. 2867

HON. W. HENSON MOORE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 3, 1983

● Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2867, the Hazardous Waste Control and Enforcement Act, passed the House this evening by a voice vote. I want the RECORD to show that I was present, on the House floor, and voted "aye" on final passage of this important legislation.●